



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 3433 07078664 9



103 CM

2000





THE
ENGLISH REVIEW.

VOL. XIII.

DECEMBER—JUNE.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

W. W. W. W.
W. W. W. W.
W. W. W. W.

CONTENTS

OF

No. XXV.

ART.

PAGE

- I.—Cabramatta and Woodleigh Farm. By Mrs. Vidal 1
- II.—1. History and Present State of the Education Question ;
being a collection of Documents explanatory of the pro-
ceedings of the Committee of Privy Council on Education,
from its first appointment, in 1839, to the present time,
and of the steps taken for the defence of Church Educa-
tion against the encroachments of the said Committee.
2. Report of the Sub-Committee on Education. Adopted by
the General Committee of the London Union on Church
Matters, August 6, 1849.
3. The Privy Council and the National Society. The ques-
tion concerning the Management of Church of England
Schools stated and examined. By Henry Parr Hamilton,
M.A., F.R.S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge ;
Rector of Watt, and Rural Dean .
4. A Bill to promote the Secular Education of the People in
England and Wales. Proposed and brought in by Mr.
William Johnson Fox, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Osborne.
Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, Feb-
ruary 26, 1850.
5. The Social Condition and the Education of the People in
England and Europe ; showing the results of the Primary
Schools, and of the Division of Landed Property, in
Foreign Countries. By Joseph Kay, M.A., of Trinity
College, Cambridge, Barrister-at-Law, and late Travelling
Bachelor of the University of Cambridge. 2 Vols. . . . 10
- III.—The History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace,
1816—1846. By Harriet Martineau 44
- IV.—1. The Doctrine of the Church of England, as to the
Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants. With an Ap-
pendix, containing the Baptismal Services of Luther and the
Nuremburg and Cologne Liturgies. By William Goode,
M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Allhallows the Great and Less,
London. Second Edition.
2. The Doctrine of Holy Baptism, with Remarks on the Rev.
W. Goode's "Effects of Infant Baptism." By Robert
Isaac Wilberforce, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding.
3. The Argument of Dr. Bayford in behalf of the Rev. G. C.
Gorham, in the Arches Court of Canterbury.

CONTENTS.

ART.		PA
4.	Church Matters in MDCCCL. No. 1. Trial of Doctrine. By the Rev. John Keble, M.A., Vicar of Hursley.	
5.	A First Letter on the present position of the High Church Party in the Church of England. By the Rev. William Maskell, Vicar of St. Mary Church. The Royal Supremacy and the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.	
6.	Bishop Jewell on the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper.	
7.	Baptismal Regeneration, &c. By the Rev. G. Townsend, D.D., &c.	
8.	The Opponents of Baptismal Regeneration Solemnly Warned, &c. By the Rev. W. B. Barter.	
9.	A Scriptural View of the Rites of Baptism. By Jeremiah Jackson, M.A., Rector of Elm with Emneth.	
10.	The Doctrine of Holy Baptism Explained. By the Rev. C. E. Douglas, B.A., Curate of Brighton.	
11.	Suggestions to Minds Perplexed by the Gorham Case. A Sermon. By the Rev. W. Sewell, B.D., &c.....	
V.—	The Life of Torquato Tasso. By the Rev. R. Milman. 2 Vols.	1
VI.—	Œdipus, King of Thebes; translated from the "Œdipus Tyrannus" of Sophocles. By Sir Francis Hastings Doyle	1
VII.—	1. The Church, the Crown, and the State. Two Sermons. By the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, M.A.	
	2. The Things of Cæsar and the Things of God. A Discourse by W. Dodsworth, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras.	
	3. The Reformers of the Anglican Church, and Mr. Macaulay's History of England. Second Edition. By E. C. Harrington, M.A., Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter.	
	4. Addresses of the London Church Union.	
	5. Rules of the London, Bristol, Metropolitan, Leicester, Leamington, Yeovil, Dorset, Plymouth, Gloucester, Church Unions.	
	6. The present Crisis of the Church of England. Illustrated by a brief Inquiry as to the Royal Supremacy, &c. By W. J. Irons, B.D., Vicar of Brompton	1
VIII.—	1. A Speech delivered in the House of Commons on Thursday, May 3, 1849, on the Motion for the Second Reading of Mr. Stuart Wortley's Bill for Altering the Law of Marriage. By Roundell Palmer, Q.C., M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, M.P. for Plymouth.	
	2. An Examination of the Scriptural Grounds on which the Prohibition against Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister is based. By John Darling, M.A., Barrister at Law.	
	3. A Summary of the Chief Arguments for and against Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.....	1

CONTENTS

OF

No. XXVI.

ART.	PAGE
I.—The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul: with Dissertations on the Sources of the Writings of St. Luke, and the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. By James Smith, Esq., of Jordan Hill, F.R.S., &c.	257
II.—1. Report of the Case of the Right Rev. R. D. Hampden, D.D., Lord Bishop Elect of Hereford, in Hereford Cathedral, the Ecclesiastical Courts, and the Queen's Bench. By Richard Jebb, Esq., M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law.	
2. The Ecclesiastical Law. By Richard Burn, LL.D. By Robert Phillimore, D.C.L., Advocate in Doctors' Commons, &c.	279
III.—1. Democracy and its Mission. By M. Guizot.	
2. The Causes of the Success of the English Revolution, 1640—1688. By M. Guizot.	
3. The Revolution in France, a warning to England.....	316
IV.—The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority, but Limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members. By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, &c.	330
V.—The Guardian: Wednesday, June 5, 1850. The Morning Post: Tuesday, June 4, 1850	361
VI.—1. Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter. "The Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, &c."	
2. A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from the Bishop of Exeter.	
3. A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, containing an Examination of his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from Wm. Goode, M.A., F.S.A.	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
4. A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on the Position which he has taken in the present Crisis. By Wm. Dods- worth, M.A.	
5. Reasons for not signing the proposed Address to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Worcester, &c., in a Letter to the Rev. J. L. Claughton. By the Rev. H. Hastings, M.A.	
6. A Letter to the Hon. R. Cavendish, on the recent Judg- ment of the Court of Appeal as affecting the Doctrine of the Church. By Julius Chas. Hare, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes.	
7. A Letter to Archdeacon Hare on the Judgment of the Gor- ham Case, from the Hon. R. Cavendish	374
VII.—The Book of Mormon; an Account written by the hand of Mormon, upon Plates taken from the Plates of Nephi. Translated by Joseph Smith, Jun., Kirtland, Ohio.	
2. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; selected from the Revelations of God. By Joseph Smith, President.	
3. The History of the Saints, or an Exposé of Joe Smith and Mormonism. By John C. Bennett, General and Doctor of Medicine, Boston, and New York.	
4. The City of the Mormons, or Three Days at Nauvoo, in 1842. By the Rev. H. Caswall, M.A., Author of "America and the American Church."	
5. The Prophet of the Nineteenth Century; or the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Mormons, or Latter Day Saints: to which is appended, an Analysis of the Book of Mormon. By the Rev. H. Caswall, M.A., Professor of Divinity, Kemper College, Missouri; and Author of "America and the American Church," "City of the Mormons," &c.	
6. Letters exhibiting the most prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. By Orson Spence, A.B., President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in Europe, in reply to the Rev. William Cas- wall, A.M., Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A.	399
Notices, &c.	441
Foreign and Colonial Intelligence	487

INDEX

OF

BOOKS REVIEWED.

. For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

- Alford—Sermons.* By Henry Alford, B.D., Vicar of Wymeswold, 483.
- Alison—Essays: Political, Historical, and Miscellaneous.* By Archibald Alison, LL.D., 483.
- Allies, Rev. T. W.—On "the Royal Supremacy,"* 485.
- Anderdon—The Words from the Cross.* By the Rev. W. H. Anderdon, M.A., 232.
- Ansted—An Elementary course of Geology, Mineralogy, and Physical Geography.* By Professor D. T. Ansted, 478.
- Babington—The Oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes.* By Churchill Babington, M.A., 227.
- Barter—The Opponents of Baptismal Regeneration solemnly Warned.* By the Rev. W. B. Barter, 66.
- Bayford—The Argument of Dr. Bayford in behalf of the Rev. G. C. Gorham,* 66.
- Bell—New Elucidation of the Principles of Speech and Elocution.* By Alexander Melville Bell, Professor of Elocution, 453.
- Bennett—Letters to my Children, on Moral Subjects.* By the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, 480.
- Bennett—The Church, the Crown, and the State.* By the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, 173.
- Bennett—The History of the Saints; or, an Exposé of Joe Smith and Mormonism.* By John C. Bennett, 399.
- Bland—Plain Parish Sermons, preached at Rotherhithe.* By the Rev. Philip Bland, B.A., 479.
- Bowlby—The Resurrection of the Flesh. Seven Lectures on 1 Cor. xv.* By Henry Bond Bowlby, M.A., 468.
- Brown—Translation of Herman Venema's Institutes of Theology.* By the Rev. Alex. W. Brown, 483.
- Bushnell—God in Christ. Three Discourses.* By Horace Bushnell, 481.
- Butler—Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine, in reply to Mr. Newman's Essay.* By the Rev. W. Archer Butler. Edited by the Rev. Thomas Woodward, 466.
- Cabramatta and Woodleigh Farm.* By Mrs. Vidal, 1.
- Caswall—The City of the Mormons; or, three days at Nauvoo, in 1842.* By the Rev. H. Caswall, M.A., 399.
- Caswall—The Prophet of the Nineteenth Century; or, the Rise, Progress, and present State of the Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints.* By the Rev. H. Caswall, 399.
- Cathedral Music, Practical Remarks on the Reformation of,* 221.
- Cavendish—Letter to Archdeacon Hare on the Judgment of the Gorham Case, from the Hon. R. Cavendish,* 374.
- Chevalier—An Exposition of the Creed of Bishop Pearson.* Revised and corrected by the Rev. Temple Chevallier, 476.
- Chronological Catena of ancient Fathers and Councils, together with the Teaching of more recent Divines of our Church, on the Doctrine of Spiritual Regeneration in Holy Baptism,* 449.
- Church Guilds, Prayers, and Rules, for the Ordering and Use of a Church Guild,* 481.
- City of God, the, a Symbolical History of the Church of all Ages,* 231.
- Clough—Poems.* By Arthur H. Clough, 207.
- Clough—The Bothie of Toper-Na-Fuosich.* By Arthur H. Clough, 207.
- Cook—The Acts of the Apostles, with a Commentary, and Practical and Devotional Suggestions for Readers of the English Bible.* By the Rev. F. C. Cook, M.A., 443.
- Cumming—Apocalyptic Sketches or Lectures on the Seven Churches of Asia Minor.* By the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D., 482.
- Darling—The Scripture Grounds of the Prohibition against Marriage with a deceased Wife's Sister.* By John Darling, M.A., 197.
- De Haviland—Outline of the History of Ancient and Modern Rome.* By Mr. Charles De Haviland, 227.

- Diaconate, the, and the Poor. The Duty of the Laity of England briefly Considered, with Reference to the above two objects.* By a Parish Priest, 462.
- Dikes, Rev. T.—Memoirs of.* By the Rev. John King, M.A., 459.
- Dodgson—The Controversy of Faith.—Advice to Candidates for Holy Orders,* 481.
- Dodsworth, Rev. W.—His Sermon. "A House Divided against itself,"* 485.
- Dodsworth—Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on the Position which he has taken in the Present Crisis.* By W. Dodsworth, M.A., 374.
- Douglas—The Doctrine of Holy Baptism Explained.* By the Rev. C. E. Douglas, 66.
- Dowell—The Churchman's Companion, at Home, and in Distant Lands.* By the Rev. Thomas Dowell, M.A., 458.
- Doyle—Ædipus.* Translated by Sir F. H. Doyle, 151.
- Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of Ireland.* Published under the sanction of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain, 450.
- Ecclesiastical Law.* By Richard Burn, LL.D. By Robert Philimore, 270.
- Evans—Scripture Biography.* By the Rev. Robert Wilson Evans, B.D., 462.
- Evening Thoughts.* By a Physician, 482.
- Exeter—Letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Bishop of Exeter,* 374.
- Forsyth, Rev. J. H.—His Sermons, and a Memoir of him,* by the Rev. E. Wilson, 231.
- Freeman, Mr.—His Essay on the Origin and Development of Window Tracery in England,* 484.
- Girdlestone, Mr.—His Pamphlet on "the Committee of Council on Education; an imaginary Enemy a real Friend,"* 486.
- Goode—Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, containing an Examination of his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from Wm. Goode, M.A.,* 374.
- Goode—The Doctrine of the Church of England, as to the effects of Baptism in the case of Infants.* By William Goode, M.A., 66.
- Goodsir—An Arctic Voyage to Baffin's Bay and Lancaster Sound, in search of Friends, with Sir John Franklin.* By Robert Anstruther Goodsir, 477.
- Gorham, v. the Bishop of Exeter. "The Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council," &c.* Seeleys, 374.
- Gresley—A Help to Prayer: in six Tracts.* By the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A., 450.
- Grinfield, Rev. E. W.—His "Apology for the Septuagint,"* 483. 486.
- Grinfield, Rev. E. W.—His Letter to Dr. Wiseman on an interpolated Passage in the Vatican Septuagint,* 486.
- Guardian Angels: a Sacred Allegory.* By Mary N. Lester, 481.
- Guizot—Democracy and its Mission.* By M. Guizot, 316.
- Guizot—The Cause of the Success of the English Revolution, 1640—1688.* By M. Guizot, 316.
- Hale, Archdeacon—His "Duties of Deacons and Priests Compared,"* 486.
- Hamilton—The Privy Council and the National Society.* By H. P. Hamilton, M.A., 10.
- Harry and Archie; or, First and Last Communion.* By the Rev. E. Monro, M.A., 466.
- Hare—Letter to the Hon. R. Cavendish, on the recent Judgment of the Court of Appeal, as affecting the Judgment of the Church.* By Julius Charles Hare, Archdeacon of Lewes, 374.
- Harrington, Chancellor—On the Reconsecration, Reconciliation, &c. of Churches,* 486.
- Harrington—The Reformers of the Anglican Church.* By Chancellor Harrington, 173.
- Harvey—Manual of the British Marine Algæ.* By William H. Harvey, 467.
- Haslam—The Cross and the Serpent.* By the Rev. W. Haslam, 451.
- Hastings—Reasons for not Signing the proposed Address to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Worcester; in a Letter to the Rev. J. L. Claughton.* By the Rev. H. Hastings, M.A., 374.
- Heiress in her Minority, the,* 212.
- Hervey—Sermons for the Sundays and principal Holydays.* By the Rev. Lord Arthur Hervey, 469.
- History and Present State of the Education Question,* 10.
- Hoare—Three Letters to Sir George Grey, Bart., on the Baptismal and Educational Questions.* By the Rev. W. H. Hoare, M.A., 445. 485.
- Holy Men of Old; being Short Notices of such as are named in the Calendar of the English Church,* 475.
- Hone—A Plea for Peace. A Charge delivered at his Primary Visitation.* By the Rev. B. Hone, Archdeacon of Worcester, 471.

Hook, Dr.—His "*Present Crisis of the Church*," 485.

Hughes—*Sermons*. By the Rev. Henry Hughes, Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Gordon-square, 467.

Irons—*The Judgments on Baptismal Regeneration*. By W. J. Irons, B.D., 476.

Irons—*The Present Crisis of the Church of England*. By the Rev. W. J. Irons, 179.

Jackson—*Scriptural View of the Rites of Baptism*. By Jeremiah Jackson, M.A., 66.

Jewel and Hooker, a *Brief Vindication of*. By a Fellow of a College, 485.

Jewell, Bishop—*On the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper*, 66.

Johnson, Dr.—*His Religious Life and his Death*, 230.

Judicial Committee of Privy Council, the, and the Petition for a Church Tribunal. By an Anglican Layman, 486.

Kay—*The Social Condition and Education of the People in England and Europe*. By Joseph Kay, M.A., 10.

Keble—*Church Matters in 1850*. By the Rev. John Keble, M.A., 66.

Landon—*A New General Ecclesiastical Dictionary*. By the Rev. E. H. Landon, 229.

Liber Precum Publicarum, etc., 476.

Litton—*A Sermon on John iii. 5., in reference to the Case of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*. By E. A. Litton, 471.

Lyttelton—*Dangers to Truth from Controversy and Agitation. Visitation Sermon*. By the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton, 471.

Madeira, *Treatise on the Climate and Meteorology of*. By the late J. H. Mason. Edited by J. S. Knowles, 479.

Maguire—*Letters in Vindication of the Church of Ireland*. By the Rev. J. M. Maguire, 474.

Manual of British Marine Algæ. By William Henry Harvey, 467.

Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister, Arguments for and against, 197.

Martineau—*History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*. By Harriet Martineau, 44.

Maskell—*Letters on the Present Position of the High Church Party*. By the Rev. W. Maskell, 66. 485.

Maskell, Rev. W., *Sermons of the*, 230.

Massey—*Common Sense versus Common Law*. By William Massey, Esq., 480.

Meditation on the Bible, Result of; or, an Inquiry into Truth, 474.

Mill, Dr.; his *Sermon before the University of Cambridge*, 484.

Miller—*Footprints of the Creator; or, the Asterolepsis of Stromness*. By Hugh Miller, 461.

Milman—*The Life of Torquato Tasso*. By the Rev. R. Milman, 125.

Monro, Rev. E.—His "*Few Words on the Spirit in which Men are meeting the Present Crisis of the Church*," 486.

Mormon, the Book of; an Account written by the hand of Mormon upon Plates taken from the Plates of Nephi. Translated by Joseph Smith, 309.

Mure—*A Critical History of the Language and Situation of Ancient Greece*. By William Mure of Caldwell, 482.

Neale—*Deeds of Faith; Stories for Children from Church History*. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, 475.

Neale, Mr.—*His History of the Holy Eastern Church*, 484.

Newman—*Phases of Faith; or, Passages from the History of my Creed*. By Francis William Newman, 481.

Original Ballads. Edited by the Rev. Henry Thompson, M.A., 230.

Parson's Home, the. A Poem. By an English Vicar, 476.

Pentateuch, an Historico-Critical Introduction to the. By Professor H. A. Ch. Hävernicks. Translated by Alex. Thomson, M.A., 470.

Pilgrimage to St. Mary of Walsingham and St. Thomas of Canterbury. By Desiderius Erasmus. Newly translated by John Gough Nichols, F.S.A., 462.

Pilgrim's Handbook, the; or, Counsel and Comfort for the Wayfarer of Zion, 469.

Pinart—*Meditations on the suffering Life on Earth of our Lord and only Saviour*. From the French of Pinart, 468.

Pott—"Bear ye one another's Burdens." *Sermon preached in the Chapel of the Magdalen Hospital, London*. By Alfred Pott, M.A., 450.

Potts—*Sketches of Character, and other Pieces in Verse*. By Anna H. Potts, 475.

Prichard—*Sermons*. By the late Rev. James Cowles Prichard, 476.

- Pusey**—*The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority, but limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members.* By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., 330.
- Ramsay**—*Three Advent Sermons.* By Edward B. Ramsay, 480.
- Remarks on the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council.** By a Solicitor, 450.
- Report of the Sub-Committee on Education,** 10.
- Reverberations,** 213.
- Revolution in France, a warning to England,** 316.
- Robins**—*The Church Schoolmaster.* By the Rev. Sanderson Robins, M.A., 469.
- Ross**—*Letters on Secession to Rome.* By the Rev. J. Lockhart Ross, M.A., 232.
- Scottish Magazine, the, No. XXVIII.,** 485.
- Scott**—*Plea for the Faithful Restoration of our Ancient Churches.* By George Gilbert Scott, 480.
- Self-devotion; or, the Prussians at Hochkirch.** From the German of Frederica Schwann, 466.
- Sewell**—*Suggestions to Minds perplexed by the Gorham Case.* By the Rev. W. Sewell, 66.
- Sewell**—*The Character of Pilate, and the Spirit of the Age. Sermons.* By the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A., 452.
- Sharpe, Mr.**—*His "Decorative Window Tracery,"* 484.
- Shirley, Memoirs of Dr., Bishop of Sodor and Man.** Edited by Archdeacon Hill, 475.
- "Singers of the Sanctuary," the, and the Missionary.** By the Author of "Angel's Work," 452.
- Sister's Care; a Story of real Life,** 466.
- Smith**—*The Book of Doctrines and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; selected from the Revelations of God.* By Joseph Smith, President, 399.
- Smith**—*The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul.* By James Smith, Esq., of Jordan Hill, 257.
- Sortain**—*Sermons.* By Joseph Sortain, A.B., Minister of North-street Chapel, Brighton, 447.
- Spring**—*The Mercy-Seat; Thoughts suggested by the Lord's Prayer.* By Gardiner Spring, D.D., 469.
- "Stand fast in the Faith."** By the Curate of Stoke Damarel, 481.
- St. Paul, the Voyage and Shipwreck of.** By James Smith, Esq., 257.
- Strayed Reveller, the, and other Poems,** 207.
- The Age: being a Letter to a Society for the Improvement of Sacred Architecture,** 473.
- Tomkins**—*The Influence of the Hebrew and Christian Revelations on Ancient Heathen Writers.* By Samuel Tomkins, 481.
- Townsend**—*Baptismal Regeneration.* By the Rev. G. Townsend, D.D., 66.
- Townsend**—*Scriptural Communion with God; or, the Pentateuch and Book of Job: arranged in Historical and Chronological Order.* By the Rev. George Townsend, D.D., 460.
- Vaughan**—*Nine Sermons, preached in the Chapel of Harrow School.* By Charles John Vaughan, D.D., 461.
- Vaughan**—*Sermons, University and Parochial.* By Edward Thomas Vaughan, M.A., 472.
- Vegetation Messenger, the,** 225.
- Voice from the North, Nos. I. and II.,** 464.
- Walcott**—*Memoirs of the City of Westminster, St. Peter's College, &c.* By the Rev. M. S. C. Walcott, 468.
- Wanderings of a Pilgrim in search of the Picturesque, during Four-and-twenty Years in the East; with Revelations of Life in the Zenana,** 441.
- Watson**—*Jesus the Giver and Fulfiller of the New Law. Eight Sermons on the Beatitudes.* By the Rev. Alex. Watson, 483.
- Wilberforce**—*Sermons on the New Birth of Man's Nature.* By Archdeacon R. J. Wilberforce, 472.
- Wilberforce**—*The Doctrine of Holy Baptism.* By Archdeacon R. J. Wilberforce, 66.
- Williams**—*The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry Harmonized; with Reflections.* By the Rev. Isaac Williams, 483.
- Wilson**—*Plain Sermons on the Holy Sacraments.* By the Rev. Benjamin Wilson, 229.
- Woodward**—*Sermons.* By Francis B. Woodward, M.A., 226.
- Wordsworth**—*Occasional Sermons, preached in Westminster Abbey.* By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., 470.
- Worgan, Mr.**—*His Plea for the Church of England,* 484.

THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

MARCH, 1850.

ART. I.—*Cabramatta and Woodleigh Farm.* By Mrs. VIDAL.
London: Rivingtons. 1850.

WE have our schools, our books, our various weapons of influence for the high and low, for the rich and poor. Church literature, whether sermons, biographies, tales, allegories, lie on the polished surface of rosewood tables in drawing-rooms small and great. Tracts, tales, allegories, also lie on the round deal table or the deal shelf of poor men's homes. The matter of this literature is suited to the class among which it finds its way. We have books full of cottage life, or full of drawing-room life; we describe cottagers and their habits, their mode of life, their ways of speech, or homely expressions; we describe the manners of the higher orders with like care, and in more delicate lines paint their features, describe their defects, temptations, duties, habits, character of mind. There are the "Margaret Percevals" for the one, the "Susan Carters" for the other; the literary ware is adapted to its market, and the literary manufactory sends forth from the printer's loom cotton for the one class, satin and velvet for the other. We are wisely issuing our literary bales for these two classes in increasing numbers, and we may also hope that we are sending forth better and heartier stuff.

So also is it with our schools; we have an abundant, an increasing supply of schools for the higher orders. From Eton to Marlborough there is a sliding scale of expense, so that the various grades of the higher orders may find something suited to their means, while a warmer and more religious spirit begins to leaven the system of education, such a school as Radley having been expressly formed to give a more religious and churchlike character to school life. We have, also, not an abundant, but a fast increasing supply of schools for the poor; national schools, containing from five hundred to fifty scholars, are dotted over the land, and at a penny a week good education is supplied to the poor, the clergy devoting themselves with increasing energy to the formation of the religious character of the children they teach.

And what we have said of literature or schools may be said of all other ways or modes of acting on the minds of the rich or of the poor; much has been done, more is doing, and much more is about to be done by the Church for the spiritual elevation of both these classes.

But one class has almost escaped all notice; we have walked

amid the cedars of the mountains ; we have laboured in the flats and levels at the bottom of the hills ; but the half-way district, the middle region of men, the middling classes, have but slightly attracted the Church's toils. We have left this important class alone ; we have let it increase amongst us without grappling with it in any deep or searching way ; its internal life is almost as unknown as Central Africa ; its internal codes, its principles, its habits, its modes of thought, its temptations, its amusements, all lie like an unexplored desert or a frozen sea. The whole class of tradesmen and shopkeepers with their maxims, their conventionalities, their usages have been well-nigh untouched. We look in at the shop windows ; we traffick across the counter ; we receive, as purchasers, studied civility ; we look at the respectful outsides of men ; we hold mercantile converse ; but here all communication ends : it is a mere buying or selling intercourse, a cold, stiff, business-like interchange of words ; our talk is of ribbons, or grocery, or furniture, or plate, as it may be ; it is mere shopping. But what foot has got past all those bales of goods, those long counters with busy customers on one side, and pale shopmen or shopwomen on the other ? What foot has pressed in to the shop "parlour," or to the apprentices' room, or learnt the private life of the principal, or the private manners of the apprentices ? Who knows any thing, for instance, of the goings on, the recreations, the leisure hours of the young men in the large drapers' shops who are measuring tapes, or silks, or calico all the day ? The clergy, if the truth be told, have but little knowledge on this matter : and as they have little knowledge, they have little weight : they feel their tradesmen to be difficult parishioners to deal with or to know ; and not unnaturally, though wrongly, they have somewhat shrunk from diving deeper into the character of this class, or from throwing themselves into their ways and working themselves into any thing like real communion. They pass into drawing-rooms ; they mix with the higher orders, because they have come from them, and this is their natural position : it is true that they are now acting upon the higher orders in a more ministerial way, and are obtaining a wholesome influence of a higher kind ; but their position by birth helps them in this matter ; there are many sympathies between them and the higher orders. They also find no difficulty in a free thorough intercourse with the poor ; they lift up the latch of the cottage or of the houses in the back streets, and take their seat by the fireside, and are received with friendly courtesy ; the intercourse on both sides is open, genuine, and unreserved, without artificial stiffness. But with the tradesmen it is different. An occasional formal call, an occasional admission into the parlour, in which hang the portraits of the

tradesman and his wife, an occasional occupation of the bright mahogany arm-chair with its horse-hair bottom, is as much as many clergy can boast of; while the conversation is on both sides stiff, conventional, icy, and restrained. Neither party really knows each other; neither party talks freely; neither party thaws; and the visit ends with little fruit on either side.

We do not mean to say that the ice is not thick, and that it is not a difficult matter to thrust the wedge into the thick-grained material of that peculiar class, which, as it hangs between the high and low, just risen above the low and aspiring towards the high, wants the natural courtesy or freedom of the one, and the more easy and conscious refinement of the other; it is a class somewhat touchy, sensitive, afraid of not "doing the proper thing," oppressed with artificialities, afraid of losing dignity, profoundly versed in mysterious and peculiar laws of etiquette, the occupants of a middle territory which they tremblingly hold, ever fearful of aggression on either side, neither at the top of the ladder nor the bottom, suspended between earth and air, dreading to be pulled down by those beneath them or trodden down by those above them, the half-castes of our social system, too keenly alive to castes and grades, and ever suspicious of inroads on their position. But still, while many circumstances serve to make them a class difficult of access, hard intimately or closely to approach, yet enough has not been done to gain admittance among them, or to influence them for their good. With all these freezing points among them, there is heart and feeling, and many excellent traits and tendencies to be found beneath that crust of mannerism; there are sympathies that may be stirred, spiritual longings to be satisfied, when once the apparel, the artificial coating of the inner man of the heart can be unstarched. And it is now time to be stirring in this cause: past neglects must be remedied; the Church must no longer withhold herself from the tradesman class; we must not content ourselves with gazing at shop fronts; we must not creep round by the edges of the desert; but must plunge boldly into the interior life. We have lost time; we have lost ground already; large parts of London, of Manchester, of our commercial and manufacturing districts, have slipped out of our hands, and must be regained. We owe it to them to go among them, if our Church is to be the Church of all; and we may be sure that whatever class we may have neglected, therein we shall find the sharpest and strongest weapons that are formed against us.

Not only have the clergy failed as Pastors to obtain any real footing among those we speak of, of a decided kind, but other means of *influence have been little used*. Take our literature—

has this been adapted to the middling classes? Has it described a tradesman's life? Has there been any thing between our "Susan Carters" and our "Margaret Percevals," any midway works bearing directly on the peculiar state of life of these classes, showing intimate acquaintance with their peculiar features? Of course there are many books which are of a general character, which are not for this class or that, and which suit all alike. But with the various modes of thought, tone, tendencies, pursuits, influences, prejudices at work in each separate class, we want a certain degree of what may be called class writing; and, as a matter of fact, we *have* written for different classes, though we have excepted this particular class. Of course we are speaking generally throughout; there are some books for this class; there are some clergy who have found their way into their interior life.

And yet we see the leisure of the whole trading masses begins to be increased; the "Early Closing" movement is an important one, which the Church must not forget or overlook; the whole life is not given up to ribbons, and grocery, and soap; the streets in the evening no longer glitter with the light of busy shops, a glitter that was dearly bought, and that helped to burn out the minds and bodies of the shopmen so ceaselessly employed. Whether the time gained will be really gained rests much with the Church: more time is not of itself a gain; it is a space that may be filled with poisonous weeds or fair flowers; it may give occasion to wildness and hurtful festivities, or to mental improvement sanctified by a religious spirit. Never was good literature more wanted than among these freed apprentices and their masters; there is a taste for literature rising up among them; but it is not churchlike or even religious; as yet Chambers' books strew "the parlour" table and reign supreme.

Again, what influence has the Church had in the schooling of these classes? Clearly none: the "Commercial Schools" have not been in Church hands; dissenting teachers, whose so-called ministry makes no attempt to usurp hard work or pastoral duties, often consume their days and eke out their incomes by taking charge of tradesmen's children, whether in day schools or boarding-schools. We have let these youths be trained up without any efforts to mould them rightly, to gain a wholesome influence over them in the earlier and more impressible stages of their life; we have simply let them alone; their whole system of education has sprung from themselves; there has been no guiding hand, and the "Dotheboys Halls," mere trading mercenary establishments, have been the melancholy receptacles of youths, who see nothing high-minded, or generous, or self-devoted, or enthusiastic in their guides or teachers. Where we have failed to direct the

first runnings of the stream, we are not likely to make up afterwards for that neglect, and to obtain the rule of the full-grown tide; if we have not a place in the sundry "academies" that stud the land, it is no wonder that we have not weight in the after scenes of middle-class life.

And what has been the result of all this backwardness in grappling with the middling classes? As might have been expected, no where has the Church such faint or feeble hold. We have the poor; we have the rich; but in the middle ground we have but little part. Here, consequently, lies the real strength of dissent: here it lives and thrives; here are its best and most zealous sons; serious tradesmen, in most cases, will be found to have joined the ranks of dissent. In some towns, or in some districts of towns, this may be true in a greater or less degree; but, take England as a whole, there is less spirit and loyalty to the Church among the middling classes than in any other. From them the leading dissenting teachers spring; by them are sustained the vast missions of the Wesleyan and other religious sects; here is a large mass of wealth, here a large and increasing class, increasing in numbers, increasing in means, with ready money at their command, and few of the "calls" which belong to those who are owners of land, and who occupy a higher position. The vitals of dissent lie here—the churchmanship that is among them is cold, shallow, formal, getting little beyond an idea of the respectability of the Church; better circumstances often bring tradesmen into the Church, simply because the rank to which they aspire is in it. All popular agitations against the Church rise from this class and mainly end with them; they have been coldly cared for, and they return the coldness. We were eye-witnesses of the riots at Exeter some years since, and were struck by observing that the crowd, one rainy Sunday, all had umbrellas, a luxury not possessed by a mere mob, and an evidence of the component parts of that mob. Throughout that movement the poor could not be roused by the agitators; it was a middle-class agitation; we ourselves had sown to the wind, we reaped the whirlwind: we had done little for this class, and therefore they rebelled when Church authority was brought to bear upon them; we had not won them, and therefore they were in no mood for a command. Go where we will, we find, on the whole, the same state of things—the Church does not really act upon the shop population, or at best acts in a languid way.

There are indeed signs of a change, some cheering symptoms of care towards this neglected class; and the Church seems to be beginning at the beginning, that is, middle-class schools are rising up; warm, earnest spirits are throwing themselves into this school

movement, and we hail with deep joy the foundation of such true educational institutions as those at Harrow Weald and near Shoreham. Those who are there trained up with a warm and holy discipline, must be looked upon as a sort of missionaries, who will carry into their own homes the influences of the Church, and will draw towards us many hearts which are now estranged, and which only look on the outside of the Church in its character as an "Establishment." Through the young we shall spread heat and warmth into those of older age who coldly gaze at us from without, or profess but a cold and formal membership. It is impossible to over-rate the importance of such schools, and we must earnestly pray for an increased number of suchlike holy nurseries.

In literature our movements have been slower; and yet it will not do to let this sloth continue; in an intellectual age, the Church must send forth writers who shall study and meet the wants of *every* class. Every where must our books be pressed, adapted to every phase of our social system. We must have our popular literature leavened throughout with right principles, yet not thrusting them forward on every page; we must have a more direct and deeper teaching for those who begin to think more deeply. We must hasten to occupy the field over which Chambers has sent forth his armies of pale-faced, bloodless, and in this sense, symbolic books; we must have our opposing hosts of heartier works, and if there be leisure for reading among those large masses of apprentices, who now escape at an early hour from the close atmosphere and the monotonous occupations of their shop, that leisure needs to be seized upon, or else it will be given either to profitless, if not vicious literature, or to all manner of sensual excitements, to give some glitter to the fringe of a dull, wearisome, fagging day. It is an important work to direct the leisure of this younger portion of the middling classes into profitable or harmless channels. Many are at hand to ply them with wrong stimulants, to catch them as they hurry from the counter, to enlist them in wrong causes. There are fiery politicians waiting to set them on fire, to make them dissatisfied with their lot, to turn them against the higher classes, and to whisper dangerous and unsettling notions into their ears; while opportunities of speechifying are not wanting, and they begin to fancy themselves orators destined to work great changes in our social system. Or perhaps music becomes a snare, and tavern glee-clubs catch the promising voice, and lead to the desecration of a gift which might have exercised a purifying and elevating influence. In short, many and various are the snares which wait the enfranchised apprentices, as the shutters screen the scene of their labours from the passers by; and it becomes the Church to decide what is to

be done with that leisure which has been now achieved, and to supply good pursuits or guileless relaxations for those whose evenings are on their hands. At Leeds and at Exeter Christianized Mechanics' Institutes have been at work, and we trust with some success; at Exeter, a Church Music School has been the means of gathering many of the citizens together during winter nights, and we have there seen gentry, clergy, shopkeepers, bankers' clerks, a mixed company, really united by the associative principle which music undoubtedly contains. What more can be done to employ the leisure hours of those classes is a subject well worthy of anxious thought. We will content ourselves with recommending the establishment of *cheap* circulating libraries, in which a certain proportion of books, say a fourth or a fifth, shall bear a religious character.

In these remarks we have confined ourselves to town populations; we have not spoken of farmers, though this portion of the middling class deserves increased care and thought. That they have not been strongly acted upon by the Church is plain enough; that their education has been defective is proved at every confirmation; and the clergy, we suspect, have found them as a whole somewhat hard both intellectually and morally. The blame of this hardness does not entirely rest with themselves; the formation of their characters has been left to chance; no educational system has been at work on their behalf; and between the busier portions of the year their children have picked up where they could, in schools infinitely below the national schools, little learning, unleavened by any true religious principles. The fact of living in the country, where the influence of the Church is great, and where they are more constantly thrown with the clergy, has kept up an attachment to the Church which might now be ripened into a warmer feeling if the time is seized. But we must not disguise from ourselves that *time* is valuable; "coming events cast their shadows before;"—the jog-trot mode of farming is at an end; the farming schoolmaster is abroad; we are about to have the intellects of farmers sharpened by sheer necessity, and their wits brightened up; the new generation will be a different race from the old,—a race of keener, sharper men, who will not content themselves with stepping into their father's shoes, but will be shod more lightly; they will have to work harder and think more; the farming energy is roused, and there will be no dozing and dawdling over the work. It is well for us to see this and to meet it; the Church must look out and prepare herself for the change. She must provide good schools; she must win the mind of the agriculturists; the clergy must know the habits of the farmers, and we must have books adapted to their peculiar wants and needs.

And are we to forget the colonies? Here is a vast field for which work must be done at home. Few of the higher orders go out; the poor, and men of the middling classes with some little capital, make up the main body of emigrants. And are we not wanting a Colonial Literature? Should we not have our staff of writers busily engaged in adapting their writings to colonial ways, and endeavouring to raise colonial principles? Much must be done for the colonies at home; much must be done for the middling classes, who there give the key to the morals of those daughter lands; we should be able to put into the hands of the colonial clergy large gifts of books, written by those who could write with experience of Canadian and Australian life. The clergy there are too busy to publish much, and their means suffer them not to publish to any great extent. Their press must be here. Of course this is only one way of influence, but it is an important one.

Very vast is the work before the Church, even among one class, the class among whom she has laboured least. The whole class of tradesmen, small manufacturers, lesser merchants, with their clerks, apprentices, shopmen, the farming class, the better class of emigrants, all these claim earnest care and holy love. Much rests upon the character which is given to this increasing body in the next few years; it is a strong body, growing in intelligence, and growing in weight. No thoughtful mind can contemplate their progress without awe, even though the awe may be mixed with hope. Our commercial and manufacturing towns, those busy hives of English industry, hold within them strangely powerful elements for good or evil; and if the good is to predominate, there needs energy, earnestness, devotion, zeal, on the part of the Church, greater than words can paint, and such as we must pray God to give us. The next few years will be busy and momentous years indeed; the work of centuries seems to be crowded and concentrated into a narrow space; life altogether seems more full of life; we squeeze years into months; a high-pressure engine drives us on; all brains are at work; schemes, projects, enterprises, questions, are born and matured at once; every thing hurries on; we think like lightning; as we see the river dashing, rushing on, we are dizzy at the swiftness; we hardly dare think what is coming to pass, or to what pitch of civilized maturity we are striding on. Enough for us to know, as we thus look forward into the mist of future time, that we must be on our watch-towers and pray; we must be in our secret chambers as in our houses of prayer, ever praying in these momentous times; we must also throw ourselves among the poor; we must mix with the trading classes; we must move amid the higher ranks; we must try to purify, to elevate, to leaven with holy leaven every class, that great, mighty, majestic

and,—a nation of princes, the market of the world, the ruler of many lands,—may bow at the foot of the Cross, and hold fast the

Having thus briefly freed our minds on a subject which only increases in interest the more it is considered, we must not lay down pen without pausing for a moment to notice the works of one whose powers seem peculiarly adapted to deal with the middle and lower classes, and who, we hope, will devote her abilities to their cause; we allude to Mrs. Vidal, whose “*Tales of the*” have been deservedly popular, and who has just issued her volume of much power and goodness; we allude to “*Cabrera and Woodleigh Farm*.” Here we have vivid, graphic descriptions of colonial life and colonial principles; while the volume is supplied with a longer tale adapted to an English farmer’s household, detailing the sins and troubles rising up in an ill-regulated man’s establishment. A strong religious tone is diffused through this and all Mrs. Vidal’s works; while by seizing hold of the true circumstances of daily life she gives finish and reality to the picture she draws. We recommend her last volume with great confidence to our readers, and hope that her pen will be devoted to those classes whom she so thoroughly understands. We number among those useful writers who do not carry us into the remote regions of life, but are bent on giving a higher tone and better principles to those who are beneath her. With much kindness we wish her success, and trust that her labours may bear goodly fruit.

ART. II.—1. *History and Present State of the Education Question; being a collection of Documents explanatory of the proceedings of the Committee of Privy Council on Education, from its first appointment, in 1839, to the present time, and of the steps taken for the defence of Church Education against the encroachments of the said Committee.* Printed for the Metropolitan Church Union. London: Rivingtons. 1850.

2. *Report of the Sub-Committee on Education.* Adopted by the General Committee of the London Union on Church Matters, August 6, 1849.

3. *The Privy Council and the National Society. The question concerning the Management of Church of England Schools stated and examined.* By HENRY PARR HAMILTON, M.A., F.R.S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Rector of Watt, and Rural Dean. London: J. W. Parker. 1850.

4. *A Bill to promote the Secular Education of the People in England and Wales.* Proposed and brought in by Mr. William Johnson Fox, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Osborne. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, February 26, 1850.

5. *The Social Condition and the Education of the People in England and Europe; showing the results of the Primary Schools, and of the Division of Landed Property, in Foreign Countries.* By JOSEPH KAY, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, Barrister-at-Law, and late Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. London: Longmans. 1850.

THE list of publications at the head of this article affords sufficient proof that the Education question is not gone to sleep; and in keeping our readers informed of its progress, we are happy to have it in our power to announce to them the fact, that it is about to be brought to the issue to which we ventured to predict a twelve-month ago that it must ere long come, to wit, a consideration by Parliament of the whole of the facts connected with the administration of the annual Education Grant by the Committee of Council on Education. The chain of circumstances which has led to this result, is detailed in the pamphlet (No. 1) published by the Metropolitan Church Union. Among its contents we recognize with pleasure our own two articles on the subject in the numbers of March and September last—the former recapitulating the history

of the struggle between the Church and the advocates of secular education down to the beginning of last session—the latter disclosing the pernicious scheme for an extensive education of the poorer classes under the exclusive control of the Committee of Council, of which the Kneller Hall establishment is the type and the centre. As a sequel to the history of the whole question, and in particular of the proceedings of the Committee of Council, sketched out in the former of these two articles, the pamphlet before us contains the close of the correspondence between the Committee of Council on Education, and the Committee of the National Society, commencing with the letter addressed by Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, in August, 1848, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and concluding with the ultimatum of the Committee of Council of August, 1849, and the counter-ultimatum of the Committee of the National Society of December of the same year,—the sum of which is, that the National Society declines to recommend the management clauses, on the specific ground that the adoption of them is made compulsory on the part of the Committee of Council, and that the constraint thereby placed upon the founders of Church schools is at variance with the general principle of local freedom, which is one of the fundamental principles recognized from the very first by the National Society.

The latter part of this correspondence was conducted, on the part of the Committee of the National Society, under the influence of the strong Church feeling manifested at the Society's Annual Meeting, on the 6th of June of last year, a concise record of which, together with an account of the formation of the Education Committee of June the seventh, and of its proceedings up to the date of the great meeting at Willis's Rooms last month, is among the valuable collection of documents published by the Metropolitan Church Union. The Annual Meeting terminated, as our readers will remember, in the all but unanimous adoption of the resolution proposed by way of amendment by Archdeacon Manning, with the modification suggested by Mr. Denison. The resolution, in the form in which it was finally carried, was to the following effect:—

“ That this meeting acknowledges the care and attention of the Committee in conducting the correspondence still pending with the Committee of Privy Council on Education, and regrets to find that a satisfactory conclusion has not yet been attained.

“ Secondly, That while this meeting desires fully to co-operate with the State in promoting the education of the people, it is under the necessity of declaring, that no terms of co-operation can be satisfactory which shall not allow to the clergy and laity full freedom to constitute schools upon such principles and models as are both sanctioned and

commended by the order and the practice of the Church of England; and, in particular, where they shall so desire it, to put the management of their schools solely in the clergyman of their parish and the bishop of the diocese."—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, p. 71.

A wish having been expressed at the close of the meeting that an adjourned general meeting of the Society should be held in November, by which time an answer from the Committee of Council to the communication about to be addressed to it by the Committee of the National Society, founded upon the resolution of the meeting, might be expected, it was ascertained that under the Charter of the Society there is no power to hold more than one general meeting annually, and that in the month of May or June. The members of the Society at large, finding themselves thus precluded from the possibility of consulting together on the important question then pending till after the lapse of a twelvemonth, arrangements were made on the following day, to remedy the inconvenience arising out of the limitation in the Society's Charter, by the appointment of a Committee which should watch the progress of the question, and should, in the event of any emergency arising, convene a public meeting of the friends of Church Education, or, in other words, though not formally, yet virtually, a meeting of the National Society. The Committee so appointed, to which a large addition of members was subsequently made, remained in a state of quiescence until after the publication of the ultimatum of the Committee of Council on Education, when it addressed to the Committee of the National Society a letter of inquiry which constitutes one of the most important documents in the whole case, and which will be found at p. 73 of the pamphlet of the Metropolitan Church Union. Being the first official intimation which the Committee of the National Society had of the existence of the Committee of June the seventh, the inquiries were very properly introduced by a paragraph which expressly disclaims all improper interference with the functions of the Committee of the National Society, and justifies the fact of its having been constituted, by the extraordinary emergency which had arisen. As it is important that the relative position of these two bodies should be clearly understood, we insert the passage in question from the letter of the Committee of June the seventh :—

“To obviate all misconceptions concerning the character and designs of the Committee in the name of which I write, let me premise that it recognizes the National Society as the accredited organ of the Church of England in the important matter of education ; it gratefully acknowledges the long and valuable services of that Society ; it regards its

President and Committee with feelings of unfeigned respect and attachment; and it earnestly desires to maintain and advance, to the best of its ability, the welfare and efficiency of 'The Incorporated National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church.'

"I am authorized to add, that under no *ordinary* circumstances would the above Committee have been formed. But it is the deliberate conviction of a very large and respectable portion of the National Society, and of the National Church, that as far as regards education, *these are no common times*. The present is an unprecedented juncture, —a very critical emergency."—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, pp. 73, 74.

To this expression of the feelings of a large body of the Society's members, represented by the Committee of June the seventh, the Committee of the National Society responded in the following terms, in a letter addressed by the latter to Dr. Spry, the chairman of the former Committee, in February last :

"The Committee are fully sensible of the zeal and energy displayed in the cause of religious education by those gentlemen in whose name you have addressed them, and will be at all times ready to co-operate in carrying out any well-considered plan for extending its benefits, with a strict adherence to the principles of the Church."

Such being the relative position of these two Committees, we cannot but congratulate the Church on the happy expedient by which the serious difficulty created by the National Society's Charter has been avoided, and the Committee of the National Society has been placed in a position to ascertain, in a manner even more satisfactory in some respects than might possibly be the case at formal general meetings of the members, the sense of its constituents upon the great question in controversy between the Church and the State. The light in which that question is viewed by those whom the Committee of June the seventh represents, may be collected from the following passage of the letter already referred to :—

"The Committee of Council on Education, a body of recent origin, and consisting only of very few members, subject to political vicissitudes, professing in its corporate character no definite creed, but encouraging and endowing various and discordant religious opinions, concerting its measures privately, executing them silently and secretly, and thus morally disqualified by its constitution and acts from exercising *any* influence over the education of the people, yet, not satisfied with the fiscal and distributive duties for which it was originally instituted, is rapidly assuming the attitude, and engrossing the functions, of a Legislative Board of Public Instruction, and, in a manner dangerous

alike to the Constitution and religion, is invading the rights, and usurping the office, both of Parliament and of the Church.

“The measures recently adopted, and now in course of execution, by the Committee of Council, appear to those in whose name I speak to demand an immediate and general effort of temperate but uncompromising resistance, on the part of the Clergy and Laity of the Church. We cannot refrain from expressing our persuasion, that, *unless* these measures of the Committee of Council are encountered and restrained, they will establish a latitudinarian system of popular instruction, similar to that of France and Germany, which has been recently eulogized by the Committee of Council as ‘*most closely suited to the wants and abilities of a large nation.*’ (Minutes for 1848, p. 547.) *That* system has already produced in *those* countries the unhappy fruits of socialism in politics, and of scepticism in religion; and *if* the endeavours of the Committee of Council to propagate it in *England* are *not* counteracted, we believe that it will reduce *this* country to the condition of anarchy, confusion, and distress, in which those countries are plunged. It will also entail the forfeiture of the national blessings derived from the system of education administered by the Church of England, which, under Divine Providence, has long been the main source of the temporal and spiritual tranquillity and happiness of this kingdom.”—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, p. 74.

The inquiries addressed by the Committee of June the seventh to the Committee of the National Society are four in number. The first of them relates to the Management Clauses, and is to the following effect :—

“Whether the Committee of the National Society will now continue to recommend the Management Clauses?—and whether, or no, it intends to join the Committee of Council in maintaining them, as now finally propounded and imposed by their Lordships on Church schools?”—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, p. 76.

The second inquiry has reference to the establishment of the Normal School at Kneller Hall. After setting forth the character of that institution, and its close resemblance to the plan reprobated by Parliament and the country in 1839, the transfer of the education of the pauper children of the country from the care of the Church, to the control of “a purely secular board, professing, in its official capacity, no definite form of religious belief,” is pointed out as an infringement of the Society’s charter :—

“The education of the children of the poor, and especially of the poorest classes, is, it may reasonably be supposed, an object of earnest solicitude to the National Society, and it was committed to its charge by the Crown, which, ‘by and with the advice of the Privy Council’ (Charter, p. 7), incorporated the Society in the year 1817, by royal

charter, in which it is recited, as a ground of incorporation (p. 7), that the 'said society has been instituted principally for the purpose of educating the *children of the poor* in the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church, according to the Liturgy and Catechism.' Hence it appears that the education of pauper children is entrusted to the Society by the *Crown*: and the National Society, as the organ of the *Church*, has still higher rights and graver responsibilities in *that character*."—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, p. 77.

This is followed by the inquiry—

"Whether the Committee of the National Society has been consulted by the Committee of Council in framing the scheme for the establishment of Kneller Hall; whether its concurrence and co-operation in that undertaking has been sought for; and, whether any steps have been taken by the Committee of the National Society to remind the Committee of Council of the authority with which the Society was invested, and of the purposes for which it was incorporated, with the advice of the Privy Council, by the Crown; and to call to its recollection the strong remonstrances and protests contained in the resolutions moved by its late President, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and ratified in a most striking manner by a vote of the House of Lords?"—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, pp. 77, 78.

The third inquiry relates to the inspection of Church schools, and seeks to enlist the co-operation of the Committee of the National Society, in substituting a uniform system of diocesan inspection for the inspection of the Committee of Council; it runs thus:—

"Whether the Committee of the National Society is disposed to approve and promote an application to Parliament for a share of the educational grant, to be applied to the uniform establishment and efficient maintenance of diocesan inspection?"—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, p. 78.

The fourth and last inquiry solicits the sanction of the National Society's Committee to an effort to obtain the Parliamentary settlement of the question, upon a recapitulation of the whole case, suggesting the following considerations:—

"Whether the members of the Church of England can any longer acquiesce in the present position of National Education? Can they be satisfied that the functions of the Legislature and the Church should be usurped and superseded by a ministerial department, and be centralized in a small, new, and changeable board, subject to political influences, and having no distinctive religion? Can they be content to leave—can they be justified in leaving—so important a matter, temporal and spiritual, in the hands of a body so constituted as that committee is,

which (it is a melancholy duty to say), in the brief period of its ten years' existence, has given unequivocal proofs of an unscrupulous disregard for consistency and equity ; has assumed powers unknown to the laws, dangerous to the liberties, and alien to the constitution of the country ; has been continually making fresh aggressions, and putting forth new claims, capable of indefinite extension ; and has evinced an eager desire to grasp the entire management, secular and religious, of National Education ? Can they delay any longer to petition Parliament to consider whether 100,000*l.* of public money can be fitly entrusted *annually* to the management of that Committee ? Can they be willing to peril the interests, temporal and eternal, of the poorer classes of the community, which stand most in need of the guidance and control of sound religious education, especially in times of public excitement, and for whose benefit in particular the National Society was founded, and incorporated by royal authority, and who were specially committed to the teaching of the Church by her divine Head, when He declared that 'unto the poor the gospel is preached ?' "*—History and Present State of the Education Question*, pp. 79, 80.

The inquiry itself is thus conceived :—

“ Is the Committee of the National Society willing and prepared to extend the sanction and approval of its venerable name to a general effort on the part of the Church towards extricating the sacred cause of education from the hands of the Committee of Council, and to promote an appeal to the Imperial Legislature with the view of establishing and consolidating National Education on a firm basis, such as may not be shaken by changes of time and fluctuations of party, but may have a public security for its consistency and permanence in the laws of the realm and the principles of the Constitution, and may leave the National Church free and unfettered to put forth her energies in educating her children according to her own principles and practice, and thus to labour in her proper vocation and ministry, so as most effectually to promote the safety of our national institutions and the spiritual and temporal welfare of all classes of society ? ”—*History and Present State of the Education Question*, p. 80.

The Committee of the National Society being occupied in deliberating upon the answer to be given to the Committee of Council, no answer beyond an acknowledgment of its receipt reached the Committee of June the seventh, till on the eve of the meeting at Willis's Rooms, when an answer was returned to the first and second of the four inquiries before mentioned. In reply to the first, the Committee of the National Society refer to the letter addressed by them, on the 11th of December of last year, to the Committee of Council. In reply to the second, it is stated that

“ the scheme for the establishment of the Normal School at Kneller Hall was framed by the Committee of Council on Education without any

communication with the Committee of the National Society, and carried into effect without concurrence or co-operation on their part."

With respect to the third and fourth heads of inquiry, the answer is of a more reserved character, the Committee pleading

"that the Society has never yet, as such, promoted an appeal to the Legislature, and that the question of doing so at this time is one of very grave importance, which the Committee is not at present prepared to determine."

At the same time, with a view to meet the wishes and difficulties of founders of Church schools, unwilling to adopt the Management Clauses, the Committee of the National Society express their readiness

"to accept any sums of money entrusted to them for the establishment and maintenance of those schools only, the promoters of which may decline to receive aid from the Committee of Council on Education, provided the Society's terms of union are observed in such schools."

As regards the last point, the necessity of a Parliamentary settlement of the whole question, it was the less necessary for the Committee of the National Society to give any direct sanction to such a step, as they had already in their last communication to the Committee of Council asserted their conviction that "the settlement of the terms on which the Parliamentary vote shall be distributed, must be left to the Legislature."

In pursuance of the determination expressed in the letter addressed to the Committee of the National Society by the Committee of June the seventh, the last-named body convened a meeting on the 7th of February last at Willis's Rooms, as the most efficient means of conveying to Government and to the Legislature, an adequate conception of the intensity of the feeling which prevails throughout the country in reference to the education question; when the following resolutions were passed:—

"1. That, in the opinion of this meeting, the present position and circumstances of National Education are of a critical nature, and such as to cause serious alarm, on grounds both civil and religious.

"2. That the Committee of Council on Education, a body of recent origin, consisting of few members, subject to political changes, having, in their corporate capacity, no definite creed, but encouraging indiscriminately various and conflicting forms of belief,—is rapidly assuming the attitude, and engrossing the functions of a Legislative Board of Public Instruction, in a manner hitherto unknown to the laws of the land, and at variance with the principles of the Constitution; thereby fully realizing the apprehensions which were expressed in Parliament in the year 1839, by eminent prelates and laymen of the Church, and

which formed the subject of certain resolutions then moved by his Grace the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and carried in the House of Lords by an overwhelming majority.

“ 3. That, notwithstanding that vote of the House of Lords in the year 1839, and in opposition to repeated remonstrances on the part of the National Society, the Committee of Council has been continually making fresh aggressions, particularly by the promulgation of arbitrary Minutes, and by the imposition of Management Clauses upon Church Schools, as indispensable conditions of public aid, and has thus impaired the energies and obstructed the operations of the Church in the discharge of her proper functions in educating the people.

“ 4. That the system of popular instruction adopted by the Committee of Council, is avowedly formed on the model of that, which, in the opinion of this meeting, has led to most disastrous results in Germany and France; and that there is great reason to fear that, unless measures are promptly adopted to counteract the endeavours of the Committee of Council to propagate that system, it will in the end reduce *this* country to the condition of anarchy and confusion in which those nations have been recently plunged.

“ 5. That the apprehensions of this meeting respecting the tendencies of the system adopted by the Committee of Council are considerably increased by the establishment of the Normal School at Kneller Hall, at the expenditure of more than 30,000*l.* of public money without previous Parliamentary sanction; and by the system of inspection exercised under the control of the Committee of Council, over the Union Schools of this country, which measures appear to this meeting to be fraught with danger to the religion of the people, and to have been effected in violation of the spirit of a previous understanding between the Committee of Council and the Church of England.

“ 6. That, in the opinion of this meeting, it has now become necessary that an appeal should be made to the Imperial Parliament, with the view of removing the impediments created by the Committee of Council, which now preclude many Church Schools from receiving public money, voted by Parliament for Education, and contributed mainly by members of the Church; and of aiding the Church in putting forth her energies, free and unfettered, in educating the people according to her own principles, and thus most effectually promoting the peace and prosperity of the nation, and the temporal and spiritual interests of all classes of the community.

“ 7. That an address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and petitions to both Houses of Parliament, based upon the above resolutions, and now read to the meeting, be adopted.”

The attendance at this meeting, and the unanimity which prevailed, with the exception of one or two parties, who foolishly attempted to obstruct the proceedings, but were very properly prevented from carrying their purpose into effect, amply justified the conveners of it; and the tone of angry abuse in which the members

of the Committee of Council and its partisans have since assailed the meeting, and several of the principal speakers, both in Parliament and through the public press, proves at once how weak the case of the Committee of Council is, even in their own estimation, and to what extent they feel themselves to have been damaged by the meeting. The Lord President more particularly committed himself to a line of personal attack upon the veracity of the speakers, which happily furnishes the strongest possible argument for a Parliamentary inquiry into the whole subject. It is, we believe, certain that a motion for a Select Committee of Inquiry will be made in the House of Lords, immediately after Easter; and, considering the heavy grievances pleaded on the part of the Church, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the charges of exaggeration and wilful perversion of the truth publicly preferred against the promoters of the meeting by the Lord President, it is not easy to see how the Government can possibly refuse it, even if they were so inclined. Besides, the dissatisfaction which the schemes and proceedings of the Committee of Council have excited is so general, not only within the pale of the Church, but beyond it, that the Government can hardly be anxious to force their opponents into more aggressive movements, but will, in all probability, be glad to take temporary shelter under a Committee of Inquiry.

The importance of the manner in which that inquiry shall be conducted, and of the evidence that shall be tendered to the Committee, can hardly be overrated; and we take this opportunity of suggesting to the friends of Church education throughout the country, who may be able to furnish such evidence, that they should lose no time in placing themselves in communication with the Committee of June the seventh, stating the particulars of their respective grievances; in order that the case may be brought under the notice of the Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry in all its bearings, and fortified by all such facts as may serve to elucidate the pernicious operation of the Committee of Council. This it is the more imperative upon the friends of Church education to do, as no stone will be left unturned by the Committee of Council and its adherents, to elude the points on which the controversy turns, and to represent the opposition to the Committee of Council, as founded upon misconception and exaggeration. A specimen of the character of the defence which will be attempted, is already before us in the pamphlet of the Rev. Henry Parr Hamilton (No. 3, at the head of this article), which, as a masterpiece of special pleading, of false reasoning, and of deceptive assertion, is entitled to the highest praise, but which certainly has no pretension to be what it professes to be, a "Statement and Examination" of the "Question" in dispute.

The pamphlet literally swarms with misrepresentations and fallacies, which in themselves, perhaps, are scarcely worthy of notice, but which by their plausible character have so far succeeded in blinding the eyes of Churchmen to the real merits of the question, that a refutation of the more glaring and mischievous among them will not be out of place.

Mr. Hamilton sets out with an assertion which will not a little astonish those who are conversant with the history of this great controversy,—the assertion, namely, that the existence of a compact, restricting the conditions of participation in the Parliamentary grant with regard to Church schools to the right of inspection as settled in 1839-40, is “a gratuitous assumption.” According to the construction put by Mr. Hamilton upon what took place in those memorable years, there was, indeed, some sort of agreement made at that period between the Government, represented by the Committee of Council, and the Church, represented by the Committee of the National Society, and by its President the Archbishop of Canterbury; but although it was right that the terms stipulated for in that compact should be acted upon, there was nothing to prevent the Committee of Council from imposing any other terms they pleased upon the Church, over and above the terms specified in that compact. It is hard to believe, and yet we are in common charity forced to suppose, that Mr. Hamilton is writing in total ignorance of all the transactions of the period referred to; for the least knowledge of what then took place, would be sufficient to deter the boldest advocate from the line of defence which Mr. Hamilton has adopted.

An attempt had been made in 1839, of the like insidious character as all the proceedings of the Committee of Council since the return of the Whigs to power, to supersede the Church in the education of the Poor, by the establishment of a so-called national system, centring in a Normal School, the plan of which, when laid before Parliament, was the signal for a great national resistance. In the House of Commons, though Ministers had a majority on other questions, on the education question it dwindled down to five, and upon a second division to two; and in the House of Lords they had to contend against an adverse majority of 111, nearly two-thirds of the whole House voting for the Archbishop's resolutions. It was in this posture of affairs, when perseverance in their latitudinarian education scheme must have proved fatal to the continuance of the Whigs in power, that a negotiation was opened between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord President of the Council, with a view to an adjustment of the terms on which the Education Grant should be administered by the then recently created Committee of Council. The result was the settle-

ment of the terms of inspection, as set forth in the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840. The conclusion of this Concordat was formally announced in Parliament as the concession which had induced the Conservative party to withdraw in both Houses their opposition to the Committee of Council. There is a story current, on good authority, that the terms of this Concordat were reduced to writing; and that, when it had been assented to by the Archbishop on the part of the Church, the Lord President suggested, that such a document being of an unusual character, was somewhat informal, and that it would be better to record the understanding in the form of an Order in Council,—a suggestion which, as it seemed to turn upon a mere point of official etiquette, was assented to by the Archbishop. We give this anecdote, as it has reached us from a quarter likely to be well informed, merely as a curious incident in the history of these transactions, and not for the purpose of strengthening our position as regards the existence of a compact by which the terms of the grant to Church schools were limited to inspection as restricted in the Order of Council of August 10th, 1840. The Parliamentary history of that period, coupled with the order in question, furnishes conclusive evidence of the fact, that it was in consideration of this settlement of terms, and upon the faith of it, that no further Parliamentary opposition was made either to the existence of the Committee of Council on Education, or to the annual education grant. Yet Mr. Hamilton has the inconceivable hardihood to affirm, that it is “a gratuitous assumption” to represent the terms set forth in the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, as “the *sole* condition of a Parliamentary grant.” By way of supporting, contrary to an understanding which has continued for the last ten years, so preposterous a proposition, Mr. Hamilton charges those who “hazard this assertion,” with confounding the Order in Council of August 10th, 1840, with the Order in Council of June 3rd, 1839; whereas, that very Order of Council of June 3rd, 1839, and specifically the clause relied on by Mr. Hamilton, which specifies the object of the right of inspection retained for the Committee of Council, viz. “to secure a conformity with such regulations as they may approve of for the management and discipline of all schools to which aid may be granted,” is set forth as one of the chief *gravamina* in No. 3, of the Archbishop’s resolutions carried on the 5th of July following, by that triumphant majority which forced the Government to give way, and to agree to the new rules for the administration of the grant in regard to Church schools, which are embodied in the Order in Council of August 10, 1840, and from which the obnoxious clause in question was purposely and necessarily

omitted. The plea now set up by Mr. Hamilton, that the Committee of Council have a right to impose Management Clauses, or in fact any other conditions they please, and to treat the "compact" as a mere regulation touching the appointment of inspectors and the framing of their instructions, may be a correct representation of the *mala fides* of the Committee of Council; but it is a gross falsification of the real facts of the case. The Church said in effect to the State,—“I will consent to your inspection of my schools, on condition that your inspectors be appointed in a certain way, and that their instructions be framed in a certain way;” and the State accepted this as the understanding by which the future action of the Committee of Council in regard to the schools of the Church was to be regulated. To say after this, that it is open to the Committee of Council to interfere in other ways than by inspection, as, for example, by the imposition of Management Clauses,—to engraft upon the inspection a complicated machinery, tending to secularize the education of Church schools, such as is contained in the Minutes of August and December 1846,—and to take away from the Church altogether the education of her pauper children, subjecting them to the latitudinarian system of Kneller Hall,—is an insult to common sense, and an outrage upon common honesty. Bad indeed must be the cause which stands in need of such pleas for its defence!

This plea is the more remarkable, as the admission of its validity involves the admission of any future encroachments on the part of the Committee of Council, which may not have been foreseen and barred in express terms; as in fact it converts every concession made by the Church into a step gained by the secular over the spiritual power, while no guarantee whatever is given to the latter against the adoption by the former of further measures of a still more obnoxious character. It is vain, therefore, for Mr. Hamilton to commend the Management Clauses to the Church for acceptance, on the ground that “they afford the strongest security against any apprehended interference on the part of the Privy Council;” that “they are binding on the Government no less than on the Church.” This was precisely the ground on which the Church consented in 1840 to State inspection under certain restrictions; it was supposed that those were the conditions on which the Church should receive her proper share of the Education grant, and that those conditions would be “binding on the Government no less than on the Church.” They were indeed binding upon the Church, so as to subject her schools to State inspection, but they proved to be practically not binding upon the Committee of Council; which, according to Mr. Hamilton’s own showing, both has added, and, according to his

view of the matter, is entitled to add, "new conditions." If the stipulations respecting the limits of State inspection, agreed upon in 1840, were no bar to the Committee of Council enacting, in August and December 1846, an entire system of inspection, without so much as consulting the authorities of the Church, what guarantee can the Management Clauses afford, that new regulations will not be pressed upon the schools hereafter by the Committee of Council, and that the Management Clauses will not act eventually, as the compact touching inspection has already done, as fetters upon the Church, rendering it more difficult for her to defend herself against the contemplated encroachment? The same arguments will apply in one case as in the other: it will still be open to Mr. Hamilton, or to any other advocate of the Committee of Council, to press upon the Church with the *in terrorem* argument, that any lasting misunderstanding between the Privy Council and the National Society, would be "detrimental to education and calamitous to the Church," and to endorse every call for a compromise of the Church's rights and of her principles in compliance with the demands of the Committee of Council, with the exclamation:—"Woe to us, if through unfounded jealousy or distrust of the civil power, we oppose any obstacles to it for the time to come!"

It is a great and a gratuitous assumption on the part of Mr. Hamilton,—which, however, is wilfully carried on through the whole of his pamphlet,—that those who object to the legislative powers over Church Education claimed and exercised by the Committee of Council, are insensible to the value of a cordial co-operation between the Church and the State in the education of the people. So far from being insensible to it, we should, on the contrary, say, that it is because they set a very high value upon that co-operation that the friends of true Church Education object to the arbitrary proceedings and the undefined powers of the Committee of Council, as having a constant tendency to disturb and to endanger that co-operation; and because they feel convinced that such co-operation can never be permanently secured, until it is settled upon a basis which, while it respects the just rights of the Church, shall, at the same time, be sanctioned by Parliament, and shall not leave it open to that variable body, the Committee of Council, to alter and modify the terms of that co-operation, from time to time, in accordance with the interests of the party in power, or with the crotchets of any individual, whether Lord President or Secretary, by whose influence the Committee of Council may be urged on to the adoption of untried, unpractical, and pernicious theories.

We deem it unnecessary to follow Mr. Hamilton into all the sophistical arguments by which he has attempted to show that the

Management Clauses, proposed by the Committee of Council, are not objectionable, because the point concerning the intrinsic merit of the clauses is gone by; the question has ceased to be one of details; it has, most fortunately so, as we cannot help thinking, become a question of principle, and of principle only; as such it must henceforth be argued, and upon the ground of principle it must be decided. We cannot, however, pass by unnoticed one remarkable fallacy which Mr. Hamilton has put forward, and on which he builds very generally throughout his argument. To hear him one would suppose that the Committee of Council had done nothing more than endeavoured to carry into effect the rules of the National Society, to secure their adoption in all schools aided by State grants, and to make provision for their being enforced.

“The clauses, if impartially examined, will be found to have for their great object to secure the efficiency of Church schools. They violate no engagement, direct or implied, with the Church. They give practical effect to the terms of union with the National Society. They involve no principle in the smallest degree at variance with them. They contain many provisions conducive to the efficiency of Church schools, which those terms confessedly want.”—*The Privy Council and the National Society*, pp. 42, 43.

And again :—

“The very system of religious teaching approved by the rulers of the Church has been adopted by the Privy Council. The clergy have their appropriate duties and privileges secured to them. The Bishops have even a larger share of authority than was vested in them by the terms of union. The government of the school is purely local. It is confided entirely to Churchmen. This in sober truth is the grievance.” *The Privy Council and the National Society*, p. 52.

In order to substantiate this novel position, Mr. Hamilton quotes with a great appearance of fairness and documentary exactness, the National Society's terms of union, and points out the various particulars adopted from them into the Management Clauses. But he quite overlooks, or tries to make his readers overlook, the important fact, that the National Society's terms of union contain the *minimum* of Church character, required by the Society in any school to which aid shall be given from its funds. By those terms of union, the National Society says in effect to the applicants for aid :—“If you want help from our funds, we shall require, *at least*, such and such guarantees for the Church character of your school;” but at the same time, the Society leaves it quite open to any founders of schools, to give to the schools founded by them, a far more stringent Church character. The most entire local freedom is carefully preserved, and nothing

is exacted but that without which the school would cease to be a Church school altogether. Now it is this *minimum* of a Church character, which the Committee of Council have taken up, and converted into the *maximum* of a Church character, which in their scheme shall be permitted. They say in effect :—"The smallest guarantee which the National Society exacts from you, is the largest which we will permit you to have," except in particular and exceptional cases, where we cannot avoid giving a greater preponderance to Church principles, but which we have taken care so to define and to circumscribe, that our *maximum* shall not be exceeded at your discretion. The National Society says :—"You may constitute your school as you please, provided you comply with the following stipulations ;" the Committee of Council : "These are the stipulations which we will allow you to make—neither more nor less—you shall not go one jot or tittle beyond them." And this is what Mr. Hamilton calls carrying out the views and principles of the National Society !

But further ; when the National Society proposes a *minimum* of Church character, and admits the utmost latitude beyond that *minimum*, the National Society contemplates schools founded by the Church, within her pale, by her sincerely attached members. The whole movement emanates from the Church, and is confined within her boundaries. The relations between the clergyman and the laity who co-operate with him, are, therefore, as they may safely be, left to local adjustment, according to the circumstances of each case—with this single provision, that the clergyman, whose influence must necessarily preponderate, shall be subject to be checked by his ecclesiastical superior, in the event of his abusing the power naturally and inevitably devolving upon him in a parochial school. There is no ground for jealousy on either side,—while the laity confide in the clergyman and his bishop, the ecclesiastical authority treats the laity with equal confidence. No hair-splitting adjustment of their mutual relation is therefore thought of, because practically it is not required.

This state of things is altogether and most materially changed, by the introduction of an extraneous, central State authority, such as the Committee of Council is,—an authority deriving its origin from a theory of education incompatible with the principles of the Church, against which for some forty years the Church has been forced to stand on her defence,—an authority which regards the distinctive religious teaching of the Church as an impediment, reluctantly endured, to the realization of its latitudinarian schemes of what it terms "national" education. When such a State authority, central, identified with the political ministry, with all the Government influence and large sums of money

annually voted by Parliament, at its disposal, with a large and influential machinery reaching into the schoolroom, and swaying the schoolmaster by the powerful incentives of ambition and of gain, steps in and converts the *minimum* of Church character, which the Church had fixed for herself, with the most perfect liberty beyond it, into the *maximum* which this extraneous authority prescribes to the Church, taking away all liberty beyond it,—when this State authority does all in its power to convert the relation of mutual confidence between the ecclesiastical authority and the laity, into a relation of mutual jealousy, representing itself as the advocate and guardian of the rights of the laity against the clergy, not without a strong and well-founded suspicion of an intention to make use of that laity in furtherance of its pet theory of secular and latitudinarian training, in opposition to the distinctive religious teaching of the Church,—assuredly, in such a case, Churchmen, and more particularly the Clergy, who are in an especial manner the guardians of the distinctive principles of the Church, are justified in looking narrowly into the terms of the compulsory arrangement dictated to them under such circumstances; and it by no means follows, that because they were perfectly satisfied with those terms while they were only a matter of voluntary arrangement between the members of the Church among themselves, they should acquiesce in the same terms when forced upon them, as a matter of coercion, by a State authority whose principles and aims they know to be hostile to the distinctive principles of their Church.

Again, Mr. Hamilton insists, with much mis-placed emphasis, upon the fact that the State proffers assistance for the foundation of Church schools, as the price of compliance with its regulations, arbitrarily and dictatorially imposed upon the Church; and, reverting to the proceedings of the National Society, and to the conditions annexed to its grants, as a precedent, argues as if the cases were exactly parallel. But, so far from the cases being parallel, there is the greatest possible difference between them. The National Society derives its funds from the benevolence of voluntary contributors, who give their money in furtherance of certain principles; and it is, therefore, perfectly just and right that the Committee, to whom the administration of these funds is entrusted, should apply them in the manner and for the purposes intended by the donors. On the contrary, the funds administered by the Committee of Council are funds levied from the people at large, to which every individual is forced to contribute in the ratio of his general liability to public imposts; the funds are therefore public funds, to be administered on principles of strict justice and of an enlightened public policy. If the State knew its

own interest, and its duty towards the Church, to whose teaching and influence it is indebted for its stability, the State would scarcely see it consistent with sound policy to spend any of those funds in aiding and abetting the inculcation of ideas adverse to the principles of the Church. But, if the State has so far lost its character, as to be unable or afraid to discriminate between truth and error, the least the State can do is to give to the Church her fair proportion of its funds, leaving her to use them in her own way, for the education of her children in her own principles. The State has no right to tempt the Church by the offer of money, or to try to coerce her by the threat to withhold it, to an abandonment of her principles; and, in whatever measure the State becomes incapable of holding or professing any faith in its corporate capacity, precisely in the same measure does it become manifestly disqualified to co-operate with the Church in the work of education. Common fairness, in fact, common justice and propriety, ought to restrain the State from all interference with the action of the Church in the internal regulation of her schools.

All this is so plain and obvious, that it is matter of just surprise how it could have been so entirely overlooked by a gentleman of Mr. Hamilton's acuteness of mind; it can be accounted for only by the supposition that he has entered upon the consideration of the question, not in the character of an inquirer, which his title-page bespeaks, but in that of a partisan—the partisan of a cause which it is not easy to see how a Churchman, much more a clergyman, can advocate consistently with his professed convictions, and, in the case of the latter, with his ordination engagements.

We regret that we have to drag forth into light yet another fallacy of which Mr. Hamilton is guilty; a fallacy so palpable and so ridiculous, that we should hardly have thought it worth while to notice it, but for the use which has been made of it in Parliament. The fallacy is thus set forth by Mr. Hamilton himself, in the opening of his argument:—

“The clauses were never intended to be imposed on Church schools already built, but only upon such as should thereafter be built with the aid of the Parliamentary grant. The adoption of the clauses, therefore, is not a necessary condition for receiving the benefits of the new Minutes. Even when the promoters of a school reject the clauses, and build it from their own resources alone, they are not on that account excluded from those benefits. This it is material to bear in mind. The rejection of the clauses entails the loss, not of a grant towards the support of the school, but merely of a grant towards its erection,”—*The Privy Council and the National Society*, pp. 3, 4.

And again at the end, taking advantage of a loosely-worded

passage in the National Society's last letter to the Committee of Council, torn from its context, the fallacy is thus reproduced in a postscript:—

“There is some danger of this paragraph being misunderstood. From the terms in which it is expressed, it might be inferred that Church schools which rejected the management clauses would, for the time to come, be excluded from ‘all share of the Parliamentary grant for education.’ This would not be the case. The Parliamentary grant is now applied, not only to the building of schools, but also to their maintenance; and, as has been already remarked, ‘the rejection of the clauses entails the loss, not of a grant towards the *support* of the school, but merely of a grant towards its *erection*.’ Consequently, any Church school, if reported by the inspector to be efficiently conducted, will be admissible to the benefits of the Minutes of 1846, *notwithstanding that its trust-deeds may not have been constituted ‘on the model prescribed by their lordships.’*”

“It is of great importance that there should exist no misconception with respect to the exact nature and extent of the loss incurred by a school, the promoters of which decline to accept a management clause. It cannot, therefore, be too often repeated, that the recent controversy had reference solely to a *building grant*, and did not in the slightest degree affect the claim of a school to a share of the Parliamentary grant towards its maintenance, *when built*.”—*The Privy Council and the National Society*, pp. 57, 58.

The uninitiated are led to suppose that there is here an enormous misrepresentation, and that in reality all Church schools get their share of the annual grant, with the exception of those whose founders are slightly mulcted of the amount of the building grant, for their obstinacy in refusing to accept the National Society's terms of union, when forwarded to them from the Council Office. But how in reality stands the case? The reason why founders of Church schools object to the management clauses is surely not, that they are afraid of the words on the parchment of their deeds. What they are afraid of, are the Government inspectors, with their machinery of inspection provided in the minutes of August and December, 1846, with their examination books and their rewards to masters and pupil-teachers,—the introduction into their schools of the bureaucracy of the Council Office, the spirit of which was exhibited with more ostentation than discretion by one of the inspectors, who, calling before him the pupil-teachers in a parochial girls' school, proceeded thus to charge them: “Now, girls, remember, that from this day forward you are Government officers!” It is the fear of this alien element intruding itself into the parochial school, and destroying its character, that causes founders of Church schools, who know

what they are about, to decline the management clauses, which would bring them into perpetual bondage to the Committee of Council. Is it likely, then, that those who do so would afterwards apply to the Committee of Council for an annual grant, and thereby subject themselves to the operation of the very system which to eschew they deprived themselves of the benefit of the building grant? The very supposition is an absurdity. Whether the Lord President counted upon the credulity of Parliament, or whether, himself ignorant on the subject, he relied on the accuracy of Mr. Hamilton's representation, we cannot pretend to say. Certain it is, that when his lordship was brought to book by Lord Stanley, the fallacy exploded in the hands of the noble marquis, and his lordship had to make the somewhat lame confession, that, upon "searching the records," he found there was no case of an application for an annual grant from parties who had refused the building grant.

After this practical confutation, we may safely leave Mr. Hamilton alone in his ingenuity. Though the number of fallacious pleas and assertions which we noted in turning over the few pages of his pamphlet is "legion," we do not think it worth our own or our readers' while to devote to them more of our attention, considering that there are other and weightier matters still behind, which claim our notice—to wit, Mr. Fox's Education Bill, and Mr. Kay's volumes.

The simultaneous appearance of these two documents in the education case—the one in the House of Commons, the other in the warehouse of Messrs. Longman—seems to justify the surmise that there is some sort of connexion between them; a surmise which an investigation of their contents goes far to confirm. If Mr. Fox wished for a witness to testify from alleged experience to the excellency of his education scheme, he could not have put a better witness into the box than Mr. Kay; and, if Mr. Kay wished for a legislator to embody his theories in a bill, he could not have found a framer of enactments more to his mind than Mr. Fox. There is a coincidence between the "facts" of Mr. Kay's volumes and the "projects" of Mr. Fox's bill, which few will believe to be undesigned.

That Mr. Kay's volumes are written with consummate ability, it is needless to observe. It is not for the first time that he appears before the world as the literary advocate of the principles which his brother reduced to practice at the Council Office; and his worst enemies will not deny him the praise, such as it is, that he makes up in cleverness what he lacks in principle. The present work, though evidently written for the sole purpose of recommending the foreign secular education theory to the English

mind, takes professedly a much wider range, embracing in its scope the whole social condition of the lower orders in foreign countries. To follow Mr. Kay into the details of this portion of his work would encroach too largely upon our space, and lead us too far away from our immediate subject. We shall content ourselves with giving, in his own words, the upshot of the "observations" which he made in the course of his travels. It is this,—

"That the moral, intellectual, and social condition of the peasants and operatives of those parts of Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and France, where the poor have been educated, where the land has been released from the feudal laws, and where the peasants have been enabled to acquire, is very much higher, happier, and more satisfactory than that of the peasants and operatives of England; and that, while these latter are struggling in the deepest ignorance, pauperism, and moral degradation, the former are steadily and progressively attaining a condition, both socially and politically considered, of a higher, happier, and more hopeful character."—*The Social Condition and Education of the People in England and Europe, &c.*, vol. i. p. 7.

This Mr. Kay "does not hesitate to affirm," in spite of the evidence which recent events have furnished of the deep demoralization, of the turbulence, of the licentiousness, and the savage barbarism of the lower orders on the continent—in spite of the fact, that the very countries which Mr. Kay instances (with the exception of Holland) exhibit a condition in which political and social restoration appears to be all but hopeless. But Mr. Kay had a proposition to demonstrate, which is, that the state education of the continent produces the most desirable effects, while the parochial education of England stands condemned by its fruits. He was not, therefore, in a condition to take notice of such trifling symptoms of the condition of the continental populations as the revolutions of 1848, and the bayoneted peace of 1849. His business was—and right well has he performed his task—to look at the bright side of every thing abroad, and at the dark side here; to take up the recollection of some favoured rural district abroad, and to generalize his passing observations upon it—made in the light and gladsome mood in which bachelors, and especially travelling bachelors, are wont to perform the pleasurable practice of locomotion—into a general picture of the state of the country; and on the other hand, on his return, to seek out, during a November fog, and in a fit of November spleen, the darkest and most unpromising corners of the land, and, grouping together in one shocking *ensemble* all the wretchedness, the squalor, and immorality he could discover, to generalize that picture too, as a picture of the condition of the lower classes in this country. It is by this

double process of positive and negative embellishment that Mr. Kay has succeeded in making out the striking contrast which his volumes present, between the condition of the people, moral, social, and intellectual, in Papal and infidel France and Germany, and in Protestant, religious England. So striking is that contrast, and so skilful are the pictures, that, but for the startling proofs of the real character of the lower orders on the continent, which recent events have furnished, we should have had little hope of persuading any one, or even of retaining our own conviction, that the lower classes abroad are not half as good, nor the lower classes in our own land half as bad, as they are both painted by Mr. Kay.

With regard to the former, we hold ourselves absolved from the necessity of making out a case against them; they have afforded sufficient opportunity of "knowing them by their fruits" to all who are not blinded by the most inveterate prejudice and the most unreasoning political partisanship. With regard to the latter, we have no wish whatever, as our readers will readily believe, to extenuate the grievous state of neglect in which, in too many instances, the poorer classes are left to pine; still less, to advocate the abandonment of their children to all the wretchedness and ignorance which they inherit from their parents. After making large deductions for the overdrawn pictures of vice and destitution which are to be found, not only in the volumes of Mr. Kay, but too often also in the reports of philanthropic societies, and in the communications of newspaper "commissioners," we are free to admit that there is a great deficiency of education in many parts of the country; but, so far from drawing from this fact the inference which Mr. Kay draws—that they are to be subjected to the process suggested by the educational theory of the Committee of Council,—on the contrary, we conclude that the State has grossly neglected its duty by not availing itself long ago of the eminent services of that greatest of all educational machineries that any country under the sun ever possessed, the Established Church of this country, and by sacrificing to the petty and rancorous jealousies of the sectarians the sound religious and intellectual training of the great mass of the population. We agree with him, that the children of our poor are left untaught and untended, abandoned to crimes and brutalizing influences to an extent which is perfectly disgraceful to a Christian country; and further, we agree with him that sectarianism is at the bottom of the mischief: the point on which we differ is this, that he reckons the Church among the sects, and fancies that a creedless State authority can do the work which belongs to the Church alone, and which the Church alone can perform in a satisfactory manner, in a manner conducive at once to individual happiness and to the national welfare. We

have the more reason to complain of the unfairness of Mr. Kay's conclusions, as he is far from ignorant of the zeal and efficiency of the clergy in promoting the education of the poor. We gladly transcribe, in justice both to himself and to those to whose labours he bears witness, the following testimony from Mr. Kay's own pen:—

“The present system is bearing very unfairly, and very oppressively, upon many conscientious and benevolent clergymen in the remote and rural districts.

“The nation is entirely ignorant of the almost marvellous efforts which some of the clergy are making in the remote rural districts, to provide schools for the poor.

“Many poor clergymen, with not 150*l.* of annual income, are out of that small stipend supporting their schools and teachers themselves, wholly unaided either by the public or by their neighbours. How they can do it, God only knows; but that many of them, in all parts of the country, do effect this prodigy of self-denial, all the inspectors unanimously attest. These good men receive and expect no public praise as their reward. They are labouring, unheard of and unknown by their fellows, and are looking for their reward to heaven alone.

“But what a disgrace it is to us, as a nation, to impose such a burden upon any of our clergy! What a shame it is, that the small stipend of a religious and benevolent man should be made still smaller, by forcing him to pay what ought to be borne by the nation at large! And what a precarious means of support for these schools! It is not reasonable to expect, that each succeeding incumbent can or will be equally self-denying; and, when one fails to give the accustomed support, such a school must necessarily be closed.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. pp. 475, 476.

Yet, notwithstanding the practical knowledge which he evidently has of the anxiety of the clergy and of their praiseworthy exertions for the education of the people, Mr. Kay ceases not to reproach them as the great impediments to the extension of education. At one time he represents them as ignorant and incapable of superintending a school advantageously, from a want of the science of “pedagogy,”—at another time as peevish and tyrannical, likely to treat the schoolmaster with harshness and caprice, so as to require the protection of a State department of education with its staff of inspectors,—at another time unreasonably and causelessly jealous of State interference. The *animus* with which they are, as a body, regarded by Mr. Kay, shows itself at every turn; he makes no scruple to lay the whole difficulty at their door, and to threaten them with the consequences:—

“I cannot imagine any thing more injurious to the clergy, more hostile to the influence they ought to possess over the people; I cannot imagine

any thing more certain to separate the people from them, than that it should be fancied for one moment, that they oppose Government interference (after sufficient guarantees have been offered them that it is not intended to take the direction and surveillance of the moral and religious education of the people out of their hands), merely from a vain desire to manage and direct the education of the people themselves, especially after they have given such proofs of their utter inability to raise a tithe of the funds necessary for such a purpose. They are doubtless the fit and proper guardians of the religion and the morality of the country, and they are only performing their high duty, when they oppose any measure which may seem likely to undermine the religious and moral influence they ought to have ; but let them be most careful they do not demand more ; let them take care that they do not reject the assistance of Government, after having shown the country that they cannot raise one paltry half-million for the primary education of a nation of 16,000,000 souls. Far from thwarting Government, it behoves them, if they can discern the signs of the times, to be the first to demand the co-operation of the State, and to confess their inability to carry on the education of the people without it, instead of appearing for one moment satisfied with, and still less venturing for one instant to vaunt, the miserably small progress that education has yet made.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. p. 512.

Again, he says :—

“ As long as the State and the religious ministers exhibit so much distrust the one of the other, nothing can be done ; but that day will be advanced, when, after the turmoil of a fierce political strife, the people will create an educational system for themselves, and will reject the interference of the clergy altogether, having learned to associate their names with the idea of an unwillingness to advance their improvement ; and the consequence will be, that an educational system will be established void of all religion, thoroughly atheistical and revolutionary in its tendency, and which will completely overthrow all that influence, which it is most important, for the best interests of the people, that the clergy should have on the education of the nation.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. pp. 535, 536.

Such are the threats held up before the eyes of the clergy by Mr. Kay, who, we may be sure—good excellent man !—has not the least intention by his book to help to create the impression that the clergy are the great stumbling-blocks in the way of a more extensive system of popular education, and whose reverence for religious truth is thus forcibly attested by himself :—

“ What are we doing ? Behold us, in 1850, with one of the most pauperised, demoralised, and worst educated people in Europe ; with the greatest accumulated masses in the world ; with one of the most rapidly increasing populations in the world ; behold us, in 1850, deve-

loping our productive powers, giving the most tremendous stimulus to our manufactures and our population—resolved to turn the North into one vast city—to collect there the labourers of the world, and to leave them without a religion! Not only are we fearfully careless of the best interest of our brethren, not only are we acting, as if we were ourselves convinced that our religion was a lie; but we are blind to the absolute necessities of the commonwealth. The very heathens would have laughed our policy to scorn. They all saw, that even if there were no God, it was necessary to invent one for the peace of mankind; they bound their people by religious formulas, wanting although these were of all true vitality; whilst we, in an age of the world when the intelligence of the multitude is advancing with giant strides, stand still, saying to one another, it is impossible to do any thing with our neighbours, for this party differs from one religious dogma we have started, and that party differs from another; each thus assuming for himself that perfection and that infallibility, which he scorns his neighbour for pretending to; whilst, alas! all are too ready to omit the inculcation of the weightier matters of the law—judgment, and justice, and mercy.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. pp. 507, 508.

Our readers will not fail to perceive that Mr. Kay is by no means insensible to the value of religious education. Quite the contrary. He wants religion in the school. But, unfortunately, none of the existing religions will do. The sects, of course, will not put up with the religion of the Church from which they have separated; and the Church herself has an old-fashioned attachment to “the faith once delivered to the Saints,” and will not part with her “dogmas.” What, then, is to be done, in such a dilemma? Obviously, to do as the heathen did, to “invent” a religion; that “general religion” of which Kneller Hall is to be the nursery, and the Lord President the Arch-Priest; unless, indeed, we might manage to make Popery the religion of our people,—a course for which Mr. Kay seems mightily inclined:—

“The very genius of the Protestant religion requires, more than any other ever did, that its members should be educated, in order that they should be influenced by it. The different religions of the old world and the Roman Catholic religion have retained their hold upon the mind of the multitude by striking and affecting ceremonies, and by means of the senses have established their empire over the spirit of mankind. But Protestantism has thrown aside almost all, and many forms of Protestantism have thrown aside all the ceremonies, which so strongly affected the mind of the unthinking people, and which so powerfully contributed, and in many countries at the present day still so very powerfully contribute, to excite a reverential and religious feeling among the ignorant; and we boast, that ours is not a religion merely of the feelings, but peculiarly one of the understanding. But do not Protestants perceive, that in order that an intellectual religion should affect the people, it is abso-

lutely necessary, that their intellects should be fitted for the exercise, or that the religion will lose its hold upon them and be entirely neglected? What has contributed to the spread of many of the lowest kinds of dissent in this country? Simply because they have appealed to the *feelings* of the people. And so it will be, as long as we offer an intellectual and spiritual religion to a people incapable of reflection or of thought, and who cannot take any pleasure in a service, which to them appears cold, meaningless, and formal. In this way does the English Church contribute to the increase of the Ranters, the Mormonites, and all the wild and visionary enthusiasts, who have so great a hold upon the minds of the people in North Wales and in our manufacturing and mining districts, and who know right well, that a religion which appeals to the feelings and passions is the only one which can have any influence over an ignorant multitude. It is impossible for the intellectual and unimaginative Protestantism of the English Church ever to affect the masses, until the masses are sufficiently educated to dispense with all need of mental excitement, which they never will be able to do, until they can think. If, then, the Protestants of England are not willing to prepare the people for the reception of our pure and spiritual religion, and as there can be no doubt that some form of religion, even although erroneous, is better for mankind than the absence of all religion whatsoever, it surely would be better for us, if we had the ceremonial religion of the Romanists, with all its faults, capable, as it would be, of affecting and influencing an unthinking multitude, than the spiritual religion of the Protestants, requiring an educated mind for its reception, when the English Protestants have seemingly resolved they will not educate the people. Much better to have a faith for the people, although it be erroneous, than to have no faith at all.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. pp. 508—510.

Is it from such counsellors as these that our clergy are expected to receive instruction touching their duties, in regard to the religious instruction of the people? One who sees in a spiritual truth, in a doctrine of the faith, nothing but a dogma which might just as well be dispensed with,—who, upon the whole, is inclined to think superstition more efficacious in making men religious than the true faith and ordinance of God,—who is willing to put up with Popery or anythingarianism rather than allow the clergy of the Established Church to teach God’s truth, in conformity with their ordination vows;—such an one it is that ventures to lecture the clergy on their responsibilities, and to threaten them with extermination, if they continue to obstruct “national” education upon Mr. Kay’s principle, by their pertinacious adherence to the faith of the Church Catholic.

With regard to the plans which Mr. Kay proposes, they are sufficiently extensive, as well as sufficiently un-Christian and un-English.

“ Whenever we do resolve to undertake the education of the country, it will be necessary for Government so to increase its force of inspectors, as to obtain information of the exact condition of the means for education in every parish throughout the kingdom. The state of the different parishes should then be ranged under the following heads :—

“ 1. Parishes, which are already supplied with sufficient school-room.

“ 2. Parishes, which have some school-room, but require more, and are able to provide what is wanted.

“ 3. Parishes, which have some school-room, but require more, and are unable to provide what is wanted.

“ 4. Parishes, which have no school-room, but which are able to provide sufficient.

“ 5. Parishes, which have no school-room, and are not able to provide any.

“ Now, as I have already shown, and as the reports of the inspectors still more clearly show, there is no hope of any thing being done in very many parishes capable of great local efforts, unless Government requires it of them. As several of the inspectors show, over great tracts of country, there does not at present exist a single school. It is evident, therefore, that the present voluntary system cannot, with all our efforts, provide the country with schools, and that, if we are to have them, *Government must interfere, and oblige each parish, as far as it is able, and assist it when unable, to provide itself with sufficient school-room for its population.*

“ In each parish, all tenants of houses, whose rent amounts say to at least 10*l.* per annum, might be made liable to a certain rate, to be apportioned according to the wants of the parish and the number of the householders who are liable to the rate. Each of these householders might have a vote in the election of a committee of eight or ten members, for the administration of the educational expenditure of the parish. Of this committee, the clergy and the dissenting ministers ought to be, as in all European countries, *ex-officio* members.

“ Before this committee, when elected, the inspector for the district should lay an account of the exact state of education in the parish, showing the quantity of school-room required for the population ; where the required school or schools should be situated, so as best to suit the convenience of the poor of the parish ; and also how many houses for teachers should be provided. The committee might then deliberate, whether it would supply the wants of the parish by mixed schools for the different religious sects, or by separate schools for each sect, and whether it would at once provide for all the schools required, or by the imposition of separate rates in separate years. At these deliberations the clergy, the dissenting ministers, and the inspectors, should be entitled to assist the latter, by affording all necessary information as to the exact wants of the district.

“ I am firmly of opinion, that were the Government to oblige each parish to provide itself with sufficient school-room, and to leave it to the option of the several parishes whether they would support separate

or mixed schools, that there would be little difficulty. Wherever any one party was decidedly too small to establish a school for itself, it would concur in the arrangement for a mixed school. It is when Government endeavours itself to decide upon it, that all parties are alarmed, and begin to suspect ulterior designs, and to fear the effects of a scheme over which they have had no control. All that Government should do, *is to oblige each parish, as far as it is able, to supply itself with sufficient school-room*, and to leave to its own decision the *manner* in which this should be done. I am confirmed in my opinion that mixed schools would not be objected to, if the establishing of them were left to the inhabitants of the different parishes, by the experience I have had in the north, where I have frequently found schools, expressly intended for the Church, filled partly with the children of dissenters, who did not object in the least to their children remaining, even during the religious lessons given in the school. But whenever a power from without endeavours to force mixed schools upon a locality, then the clergy and the dissenting ministers, and many of the parents, begin to be alarmed. Of course Government ought to require, when a school was established for two sects, and the schoolmaster was chosen from the most numerous sect, that the children should either attend the religious lessons given in the school, or should receive daily religious instruction from one of the ministers of their own sect.

“In those cases where the committee could not agree to provide a mixed school, and where the minority was too small to support a school for themselves, the majority should be obliged and empowered to levy the rate and build the school, on condition that the minority should be allowed to send their children to the secular instruction, and remove them during the religious instruction given in the school. We should soon find, that the minority would not object to their children attending the secular instruction given at the school, and receiving their religious instruction from their own minister. Many parishes, moreover, would require *several* schools, and in these cases the committee could easily arrange, if desired, that the schools should be appropriated to the different sects, according to their respective numbers.

“Where a parish was not capable of doing more than it had already done, or of making any but very inefficient efforts, Government ought to be prepared to give the necessary assistance, instead of confining its grants, as at present, to those parishes alone, which are able to raise a considerable part of the necessary funds. But in the poorest parishes, where several schools were required, the householders ought to be consulted, whether they wish to have *separate* or *mixed* schools.

“These parish committees might be called on to meet at certain periods, to examine the state of the school-buildings, and to provide, by the levying of a small rate on the householders, for all the repairs required for all the schools and schoolmasters' houses in the parish; and when the population was increased so much, as to require another school, for the building of another school in the parish. The inspectors of the district would inform them of the exact wants of the parish.

It would be also wise to give these parish committees the power of requiring the attendance of all the children at school between certain ages, and of enforcing that attendance, whenever they saw fit to do so.

“In many districts, the parochial authorities would not object to put this regulation into force, while Government will be wholly unable for some time to enforce a general regulation of this kind. The people would not object to it, if it issued from themselves, although they would call it unwarrantable interference on the part of Government. And although, doubtless, very many districts would not consent to enforce such a regulation for some years to come, yet it would be a great gain to the country, if the inspectors could induce *any* of the towns or parishes to make such a regulation.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. pp. 515—519.

For the purpose of carrying out this extensive scheme, Mr. Kay proposes the establishment of a number of normal schools—he estimates it at forty-one for England and Wales—in which proper masters should be trained, and placed under the power and patronage of the Government:—

“In the case of all schools at present established, directed by trustees, school societies, religious congregations, or private individuals, I would, of course, leave the selection of the teachers in the hands of the persons in whom it is now vested, reserving for Government, however, the right of examining by means of its inspectors the persons chosen, and the power of annulling the election, if the candidate was found upon examination to be unfitted for the exercise of his important duties. In the case of schools erected by the parochial authorities, the teachers should be always chosen, if the school was intended for only one sect, from that sect, by its school committee, and if for several sects, by the minister and members of the school committee, who belonged to the most numerous sect in the parish, subject, however, in every case to the approval of Government. When we have a sufficient number of normal colleges, of course no person should be permitted to be a candidate for the situation of teacher, but one, who had been educated in such a college, and who had obtained a certificate from its director and professors of high moral character, and of satisfactory intellectual attainments.

“It is very important that Government should have the right of examining every candidate for the situation of a schoolmaster, and the power of rejecting him, if found upon examination unworthy of the situation.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. pp. 520, 521.

And further still:—

“The reports of the inspectors prove only too plainly, that the country can have no security against the negligence or ignorance of local authorities, until Government has the *surveillance*—I do not say the

direction, but the mere *surveillance*—of all the primary schools in the country, and a veto on the appointment *and dismissal* of all the teachers in the country. It is what all foreign countries, where education has made any progress, have granted their government, and it is what our Government must have sooner or later.”—*The Social Condition and Education of the People*, vol. ii. p. 524.

Since Mr. Kay appeals so confidently to the example of foreign countries, in which those teachers are under the immediate control of the civil government, he will not, we feel sure, consider it unfair that we should insert, as a set-off to his recommendation, a charge delivered recently to a body of schoolmasters at Heidelberg by the town magistrate, which will go further than any thing we could say, to illustrate the practical meaning of Mr. Kay's theory.

“I address myself to you, the professional teachers of schools. I must tell you that you have thoroughly agitated the country, and left nothing undone that could undermine the ground on which we stand. In this task you have spared neither zeal nor labour. The fruits of your exertions are visible to all. The generation you have trained is completely ruined; that which you are training is without hope or trust, and almost incurably corrupted. It has lost all feeling of right, of aversion to what is wrong, all respect for authority, all idea of Divine and human ordinances, all attachment to the Church and creed of their forefathers; and there is no prospect of its condition becoming better. This is for the most part your work, because you have made your schools the centres of sedition; because, instead of training the scholars intrusted to you to be good citizens and Christians, you have made of them revolutionary, discontented, and wretched men, fallen away from God and His ordinances. And yet the rising generation is still intrusted to you! If you have remaining in you one spark of Christian feeling, you cannot surely ruin these children also by training them to rebellion, seeing that your activity in the past has only brought our poor native land and the people to the verge of destruction. If this lust of sedition again seizes you, then I beg you will remember the oath you have to-day taken, and the God to whom you have raised your hands with the promise to live as true and faithful subjects of your Sovereign.”

Our readers are now in possession of the principle upon which the bill introduced into the House of Commons by the *quondam* Socinian preacher, Mr. William Johnson Fox, is founded. The principle is not new, it was broached seven years ago by Lord John Russell in the resolutions which he attempted to engraft upon Sir James Graham's Factory Education Bill¹; and it is not surprising, therefore, that a measure founded upon it should have met with so hearty a welcome at his lordship's hands. We confess

¹ See *English Review*, vol. xi. pp. 116, 117.

that we share in some degree the satisfaction expressed by the noble Premier. It saves a world of argument to have the cloven foot displayed at once. The scheme of Mr. Fox is briefly this. Inspectors appointed by the Committee of Privy Council on Education are to overrun the country, and (Clause II.) to make full and detailed reports to the Committee of Privy Council on Education, of the state of secular education in each parish of their respective districts, and of the adequacy of the existing provisions of each parish to afford secular education for the wants of the entire population thereof; in which reports “regard shall be had *to the effect of any exclusion from instruction, whether arising from the expense of schooling, from peculiar or special religious teaching adopted in any school, or from any other cause whatsoever.*” The course of proceeding to be adopted in the event of the education being found inadequate *ex gr.* from the exclusion of a few dissenting children from a Church school, is thus stated in Clause III.

“That whenever it shall appear from any such report of the inspectors of schools that the existing provisions for education in any parish are insufficient for the wants of the entire population of such parish, the Committee of Privy Council for Education shall, by a letter signed by their secretary, addressed and sent to the overseers of such parish, direct the overseers to summon a meeting of the inhabitants, within a time to be named in such letter, who shall elect not less than [*five*] nor more than [*fifteen*] of the inhabitants of such parish to form the educational committee for such parish; and thereupon the election of such educational committee, and the names of the members thereof, shall be forthwith certified to the Committee of Council on Education by the said overseers; and such educational committee shall remain in office for *twelve* calendar months from the day of election; and fifteen days at least before the expiration of such *twelve* calendar months the said overseers shall summon a meeting of the inhabitants, who shall elect a like educational committee for the year then next succeeding the expiration of the said *twelve* calendar months, and so on from time to time for every succeeding year; and after every such election the said overseers shall forthwith certify the names of the members of the educational committee so elected to the Committee of Council on Education.”

Clause IV. provides—

“That the first elected educational committee of any parish shall forthwith propose a plan to supply the deficiency of the existing provisions for secular education in such parish, for the approval of the Committee of Council on Education, and on being approved by the said Committee of Council the same shall be carried into execution by the educational committee; and such educational committee shall appoint a clerk, secretary, treasurer, or other officer, with such reasonable com-

pensation as they may think fit, to assist in executing the plan so approved as aforesaid."

The nature of the instruction to be afforded in such schools may be further collected from the provisions of Clause V.

"That in every parish where such deficiency as aforesaid shall be reported, one or more free school or schools shall be established under the provisions of this act, which shall be under the management of the educational committee of such parish, who shall appoint the schoolmaster and mistress; and in all schools established under this act (except the infant, evening, adult, and other schools hereinafter mentioned), provision shall be made for affording gratuitously sufficient instruction which shall be secular only, to all the children of each parish between the ages of *seven* and *thirteen* years; and every schoolmaster and mistress shall be allowed a net yearly salary of not less than *one hundred pounds* for every fifty pupils who shall attend the free school of such master or mistress for one year: provided always, that the same course of secular education shall be afforded to all the pupils attending any such free school as aforesaid; and all such pupils shall be free from all charges and payments whatever: provided also, that the master and mistress of every free school shall allow to each pupil sufficient time for receiving religious instruction, under the direction of the parents of such pupils: provided also, that each pupil of any free school, on completing his education, shall, upon receiving from the master or mistress of such school a certificate of approval, be entitled to books of the value of *fifty shillings*, to be selected by the said master or mistress, and one of such books shall be a copy of the Holy Scriptures; and such certificate of approval shall relate to and certify approval of the continuous and regular attendance of such pupil at school, as well as his acquirements and good conduct."

The expenses of the school are to be defrayed by means of a school rate; and in the event of any locality not proceeding to execute the orders of the Committee of Council, it is provided, in Clause XIII.,

"That in case no educational committee as aforesaid shall be elected in any parish, in pursuance of the direction of the said Committee of Council, or if no such plan as aforesaid shall be proposed by such Educational Committee, or, being proposed, shall not obtain the sanction and approval of the said Committee of Council, it shall be lawful for the said Committee of Council to undertake to supply the deficiency of provision for secular education by the establishment of a free school or schools under this act, and to exercise the powers hereby given to the Educational Committee of such parishes."

Comment upon such an enactment as this is wholly unnecessary. It is a measure of a directly revolutionary character, which, if

carried into effect, could not fail to subvert every institution in the country. There is, of course, no fear whatever of its being carried; Mr. Fox himself has no hope, Lord John Russell no idea, of its becoming law. It is introduced, significantly, *in terrorem*, with a view to coerce the clergy into co-operation with the Committee of Council, upon the principle expounded by Mr. Hamilton, who, in strange inconsistency with his assertion, that the Committee of Council desire nothing more than to give efficiency to the system of the Church, thus discloses the real object which the Committee of Council are driving at:—

“It is quite certain that the Church is incompetent to sustain, much less to extend, her present educational system without the assistance of the State. It is just as certain that the State would be unable to carry out the scheme embodied in the Minutes of 1846, without the co-operation of the Church. Their joint action, as regards Church schools, is essential to success. But, to derive from this educational alliance all the benefits which it is capable of yielding, two conditions are indispensable: that the State refrain from all interference with the religious teaching of the Church; and that the Church throw open her schools, with the fullest recognition of the rights of conscience, to the children of Nonconformists. The State has fulfilled the first of these conditions—it remains for the Church to fulfil the second. By so doing, she would give up, or compromise, none of her distinctive doctrines. She would only be exercising that forbearance towards the religious scruples of those without her pale, which sound policy recommends and which Christian charity enjoins. She would only be carrying into effect a principle, which she has herself already recognized, which other religious communions have adopted, and which the Legislature has formally sanctioned. She would thus be enabled, without the smallest sacrifice of her own tenets, to remove one of the chief obstacles to the general education of the people.”—*The Privy Council and the National Society*, pp. 53, 54.

Whether the Church is prepared to make the sacrifice of principle here recommended, may well be doubted. At present there is no appearance of it. Mr. Hamilton may try to wheedle her; the Marquis of Lansdowne and Lord John Russell may frown and scold; and Mr. Fox may try to overawe the Church with his Socinian Bill. None of these things will move the Clergy and the sound portion of the laity of the Church. They will bide their time; they will continue to remonstrate; they will carry their grievance to Parliament; and they will not rest until the Legislature shall have dealt out to them at least even-handed justice. That justice cannot be withheld much longer; the days of the Committee of Council, or, at all events, the days of its exorbitant and irresponsible power, are numbered. The struggle

is drawing to a close, and the Church has the victory all but within her grasp. The rising generation will, in the blessings of a sound religious education, reap the fruit of steadfast adherence on the part of the Church to principles which the change of times and the fickleness of men cannot affect. And when England shall, through the influence of a faithful and laborious Clergy, be once more blessed with a religious population, it will be recorded by some future historian for the admiration of posterity, that there was once a Minister of the British Crown who suffered the prejudices and the necessities of party to prevail so far over every better principle of action and every rule of wisdom, as to place himself in an attitude of hostility against the Clergy of the Established Church, and to hail with malicious pleasure the abortive Education Bill of Mr. William Johnson Fox.

ART. III.—*The History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace, 1816—1846.* By HARRIET MARTINEAU. London: Charles Knight, 90, Fleet Street. 1849.

A FEW years ago, when the mania for universal suffrage had arisen to a great height, we remember that a gentleman, at a conservative dinner, said, "that, for his part, all he wanted was universal suffrage to give England a more conservative parliament than ever." His hearers seemed astonished; but he repeated the sentiment, and, looking round to a large gallery filled with ladies, he explained himself by saying, "that, as all women were conservative, if every woman had a vote, he should have one-half of the human race with him, and at least a tolerable proportion of the other." Now, if this assertion were true, we are sorry to find at least one exception to the rule in an eminent writer of our own time. Women are generally opposed to theory and rash speculation on political subjects, but Miss Martineau is an exception to the rule; her book is a valuable addition to our modern information, and it is well put together, but the moral is bad; her great object is to inculcate what she calls progress, and what we call democratic principles. This she does sometimes temperately enough, but in the flippant style usual in her class of political economists, and with the self-satisfied assumption of her own superior knowledge, so that we sometimes feel inclined to exclaim with the patriarch of old, "Doubtless ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you." As the thirty years which elapsed from the battle of Waterloo to 1846 are to us the most important period of history, the book will probably be widely circulated; our object therefore is, if possible, to counteract the moral tendency of the work, and to show that, with considerable semblance of reason, there is abundant room for detecting fallacies. Miss Martineau, like the rest of her school of popular writers, is one who deals in words rather than ideas—"Reform," "social progress," "rotten boroughs," "noble character of the people," "great measures," "patriotic ministers," "liberal and enlightened statesmen,"—these and several other such terms are, in our view, the English translation of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," from the French. They mean really nothing but social disorder; but they catch the ear of the unwary, and lead them into serious practical errors.

Let us examine the real principles of the British constitution,

and see what it is that the nation ought to desire. There may be too much liberty; social equality is an utter impossibility; and political franchises may be a curse, and not a blessing. As we are thus contradicting much of the spirit of the age, we must begin by defining our terms, which popular writers seldom do, and we shall here cite the highest authorities we can find. "Liberty," says De Lolme, "consists in the power given by the State, that every man shall be able to enjoy the proceeds of his own industry, while, at the same time, he is taught to respect the proceeds of the industry of others." The latter part of this definition is sometimes overlooked.

In speaking of the different kinds of government, Aristotle¹ says, "The object of a monarchy is security; the object of an oligarchy is wealth; and the object of a democracy is liberty." Now the constitution of England was evidently intended to combine the three advantages, as the three elements are combined in her government. Modern politicians, however, endeavour to throw all the weight into the democratic scale; and by this means, in the endeavour to increase liberty, which was fully enjoyed before, they diminish the elements which provide for the security and prosperity of the nation.

Before Reform the three elements existed in the English government; the House of Commons, having the control of the supplies, was the most powerful of the three estates, or rather it was a combination of all three. The king's ministers sat, as a matter of course, for the government boroughs; or, if they could obtain more popular seats, the subordinates filled them up, and thus the Crown was represented in the Commons. The nobility also had a certain number of nomination seats, and thus the Lower House became the arena² on which the three powers tried their strength. The king has not for a long time exercised his right of veto; and under the old system this was fair, because he had at first nominated his advisers, and, if they were not able to command a majority, it became his duty to try a more popular administration. His real power consisted in the fact, that he had the deliberate power of choice of measures, and then asking the nation to support them, first by appointing his ministry, and, secondly, by a dissolution of parliament. This power William the Fourth ceded to his subjects. The Reform Bill became an act for perpetuating a Whig ministry in England; and, as in former reigns Whigs in office became Tories, so now, when in office, Tories are obliged to

¹ Rhet. 1. 8.

² Our readers will be surprised to learn that this idea is taken from one of the early numbers of the "Edinburgh Review," by the late Lord Jeffrey, where the old constitution is admirably explained and defended; but Radicals of the early part of the century might well pass for Tories at present.

turn Whigs. The reason is plain, the people now send the prime minister to the king, and not the king to the people ; the cabinet no longer govern by desire of the Crown, subject to the control of popular opinion ; but they are the creatures of popular opinion as represented in the House of Commons, and uncontrolled by the regal power. Instead, therefore, of an hereditary and constitutional monarch, we have an elective prime minister, and just in proportion to the destruction of the monarchical element the security of the constitution is lost. This, we can show, has been done in two ways. First as to property—Land is the most valuable property in England, because it produces food, and is least liable to waste. It binds the rich and the poor together in the relation of patron and client more firmly than any other species of property. The manufacturer dismisses his operatives at a week's notice ; a fall in the market obliges him to do so, clothes being not so necessary as food : when the nation is poor, less goods are consumed. But as there is but one harvest in the year, and food cannot be dispensed with, the tenant must hold by the year, and his produce must find a sale. His labour is, therefore, the most important to the State, and his interests are most closely identified with his master. The proprietor of land has an influence, a respectability, a power of improvement and usefulness which no other owner of property can claim ; the great object, therefore, of the industrious is to invest their proceeds in land,—

“ *Est aliquid quocunque loco, quocunque recessu,
Unius sese dominum fecisse lacertæ.*”

Now it happened in the year 1838, at a public dinner at Manchester, that certain democratic capitalists chose to express a wish that the landlords of England should divide their property with them. These landlords had agreed before to pay eight hundred millions to carry on the wars, which secured to England the carrying trade of the world, and introduced a new aristocracy of wealth. To enable the land to meet its engagements, protection had been established, and the manufacturers thought that, by laying this aside, and having food untaxed, they could diminish wages and increase their own production. Hence the cry for free trade, and the origin of the Anti-Corn-Law League. We are not here arguing on principles of political economy—we are merely stating a fact. Landlords had possession of certain emoluments by certain laws, and the League wished to take possession of them. The principle was modified communism ; you have property, we have numbers, therefore you must divide. Now how was this transfer effected ? By the power of the democracy. Large sums (we believe about a million) were subscribed ; tons' weights of tracts were circulated ; the farmers were told that the proposed

changes could not affect them, as it was merely a question of rent, and could only damage their landlords. New freeholds were created in equally balanced counties, which a Radical might obtain for about 19%. (This scheme Miss Martineau praises, while she finds fault with the Ohandos clause for giving weight to the landlords.) The effect has been that the democratic party have carried their point, and transferred a large portion of the property of their neighbours to themselves; at least, they thought they had done so, though they may be mistaken. In our opinion they will find it a mistake. God's rule of the world is to encourage every man to improve his own position, but it is also his rule to make men dependent on each other; when, therefore, a class of men agree to raise themselves by pulling down a neighbour, they often find that their own downfall is involved in the injury which they intended for others. If the agricultural interest cannot afford to buy, the manufacturing interest may not be able to sell. All property is, of course, liable to fluctuation, but no class of men have a right to create or increase this fluctuation by legislative enactment. So also it has happened in the case of the clergy. Their property (called a tenth, but really not a twentieth) was some years ago commuted for a sum varying according to the average prices of corn. Now any Act of Parliament intended to lower these averages is so much against their income, and so much added to the insecurity of property and of national faith. This is a branch of the subject on which we may naturally be expected to offer something more than a transient allusion, affecting, as it does, most seriously the interests of many of our readers. The clergy have before them the prospect of a very large diminution in their means. They must look, we fear, in the course of a few years to the annihilation of one-third of their incomes. The Church has been despoiled of more than 1,000,000% per annum of her income, by the abolition of the Corn-Laws! So much is in the course of being abstracted from the means of maintaining the education of the poor, and of dispensing alms to the distressed and afflicted. Each year the incomes of the clergy will be smaller than in the preceding year; and the power, consequently, of aiding in those charitable and religious objects which have hitherto been extensively, and in many cases almost exclusively, supported by the clergy, will be more and more limited. We must extract the following statements, which have appeared already in the public prints; the former of which, by Mr. Willich, will show how things have been, and the other how they are to be. Mr. Willich's statement is this:—

"To the Editor of the Evening Mail.

"Sir,—As your agricultural as well as clerical readers may feel anxious to know the result of the corn averages for the seven years to Christmas last, published in the 'London Gazette' of this evening, viz:—

Wheat.....	6s. 7½d.	per Imperial bushel.
Barley.....	4 1¼	ditto,
Oats.....	2 8½	ditto.

"I beg to state for their information, that each 100*l.* of rent-charge will, for the year 1850, amount to 98*l.* 16*s.* 10*d.*, or about one and one-third per cent. lower than last year.

"The following statement from my Annual Tithe Commutation Tables will show the worth of 100*l.* of rent-charge for each year since the passing of the Tithe Commutation Act, viz:—

For the year 1837	£98	13	9¾
„ 1838	97	7	11
„ 1839	95	7	9
„ 1840	98	15	9½
„ 1841	102	12	5¼
„ 1842	105	8	2¾
„ 1843	105	12	2¼
„ 1844	104	3	5½
„ 1845	103	17	11½
„ 1846	102	17	8¾
„ 1847	99	18	10¼
„ 1848	102	1	0
„ 1849	100	3	7¾
„ 1850	98	16	10
<hr/>			
	£1415	17	6¾
	14)	<hr/>	

General average for 14 years.....£101 2 8

"I am, Sir, yours obediently, "CHARLES M. WILlich."

We have now to present another view of the question contained in a very sensible and useful letter from the Rev. J. F. Francklin, who has, most properly, brought before his clerical brethren the effects of recent legislation on the interests of the Church. We cite this letter *in extenso*, because it contains statements on matters of fact which are well worthy of attention, and because its tone is perfectly unexceptionable.

"To the Clergy and Tithe-Owners.

"Gentlemen,—It may possibly appear somewhat presumptuous that so humble an individual as myself should venture to address so large and influential a class as those who (whether they be clergy or laymen) possess such considerable property as the tithe-rent-charge of this kingdom most unquestionably represents; but I trust I shall be pardoned for thus stepping forward, when it is considered that the revenues of the Church are now, openly and avowedly, threatened with spoliation by the great leader of free trade, Mr. Cobden. And, although I could

have much desired some other and more influential person had taken the matter in hand; yet, since from some cause or other which it is not my province to determine, all have alike at present shrunk from the task, I deem it a duty which I owe to all connected with ecclesiastical affairs, to lay before them the present and future prospects of the property of the tithe-owner.

"By a letter lately addressed by myself to Mr. Cobden, upon the subject of the tithe-rent-charge, I elicited from that gentleman, in reply, the acknowledgment that the revenues of the Church will be eventually reduced, by the operation of free trade, to the extent of upwards of £30 per cent. per annum.

"And I am consequently of opinion that, with this threatened injury before us, if no higher and nobler motive should influence the tithe-owner to aid and assist the agricultural interest, yet the principle of self-preservation should induce a body of men, confessedly one of the most powerful in the kingdom, to stand forward and uphold the rights and privileges of a class at once the most peaceful and simple, yet by far the most numerous in the British empire.

"Why, indeed, should the owners and tillers of the soil be unfairly burdened?—and why should the clergy in particular be unjustly deprived of their revenues? Is it that they are considered 'dumb dogs who cannot bark?' or, 'labourers who are unworthy of their hire?' If so, it is time that they be replaced by other and better men. But I deny the fact. I believe never was the Established Church so well and efficiently administered as at the present—never were the clergy more zealous and active than at this period.

"Consequently, as we have divine authority for saying, 'They who wait at the altar shall be partakers with the altar,' and that, 'it is ordained that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel,' I maintain that it is both unjust and inexpedient that the clergy should be mulcted of nearly one-third of their apportioned wages for the questionable benefit of a class of the community who, for the most part, are as turbulent and disaffected to the Government of the country as the agricultural population are loyal and peaceable.

"It may be doubted by some of my brother tithe-owners whether such an injury as I have described will be ever really inflicted upon their property; and consequently, for their information, I have subjoined a table of the next seven years' average of the tithe commutation, which will determine their incomes year by year, should wheat range no lower than 40s. per quarter, barley 21s., and oats 19s., viz. :—

£100 in 1850.....	£98 16 10
" 1851.....	97 0 8
" 1852.....	93 14 10
" 1853.....	90 7 0
" 1854.....	86 7 8
" 1855.....	77 14 10
" 1856.....	75 7 5

"The slightest fall below this standard will cause a depreciation in the general averages to the amount which I have before stated, viz., to £30 per cent. per annum.

"Having called the attention of the tithe-owners to the foregoing fact, I will say no more at present than, should they delay too long in coming forward and co-operating together with the landed interest to redress the great and grievous wrong inflicted upon the agriculturists, they will incur a serious responsibility, for they may rest assured that the battle now to be fought is not simply (as it is pretended) for free trade in corn, but

"Pro aris et focis!"

"For God, for the Queen, and the country!"

"And believe me, gentlemen, with every sentiment of respect,

"Your very humble and faithful servant,

"JOHN FAIRFAX FRANCKLIN.

"West Newton, 26th Feb. 1850."

Mr. Francklin might have carried his statement further, and might have shown that, for several years after 1856, the incomes of the clergy will probably descend at the rate of two, three, and four per cent. annually, independently of the loss in the value of their glebe lands, which takes effect *at once*.

We are borne out by these lamentable facts in stating that the Church of England has, by recent legislation, been deprived of a full THIRD of her property. She does not lose it at once; but gradually, it is true; still the fact is as we have stated it. And we regret to remember that, during the debates in the House of Lords on the subject, the probability of such a result was urged distinctly and emphatically upon the representatives of the Church in that august assembly, as a reason why *they* at least should pause before they gave their support to a measure which threatened to impoverish their clergy. That appeal, however, was made in vain. The imagined necessity of supporting the political views of the Government of the day, and of the leaders of influential political parties, outweighed the claims of a clergy whose prospects and position were extremely imperilled; and so large a majority of the Episcopal bench voted for Sir Robert Peel, that the measure may be said to have been carried by them. The speeches of the Bishops of Oxford and of St. David's will long be remembered; nor can it be forgotten that the former reverend prelate volunteered to answer on behalf of the clergy of England, for their willingness to consent to any reduction in their incomes that might be called for under the proposed Bill. The cause of the Church in Parliament was advocated by lay peers, who urged on prelates of the Church the unfairness of leaving the clergy to suffer from the reduction in the corn averages, while they them-

selves were, from the nature of their property, liable to no such reductions. The majority of the Episcopal body may have acted very wisely and properly, in their own view, in voting as they did ; but we fear that many persons have been convinced by this and similar instances, in which the interests of governments and political parties have been considered in the first place, to feel doubtful whether the Church derives great practical benefits from the presence of its bishops in the House of Lords. And it can scarcely be expected that those whose incomes were sacrificed, without scruple, for the purpose of retaining Sir Robert Peel in power, and carrying his measures, should, in all cases, feel the same kind of anxiety to maintain the incomes of the hierarchy on their present scale, if reduction should hereafter be called for, as they might have felt, had the claims of gratitude for fidelity to the Church's interests been superadded to those of personal respect, or of official connexion. The too great subserviency to the Government of the day, manifested on that and other previous occasions, more especially on the Maynooth Bill, will, we hope, be atoned for by greater fidelity hereafter. But to return to our leading subject. The attack on landed property was successful, because, since reform, the landed interest is comparatively weak. The English boroughs return 323 members, which is nearly half the whole House of 658. The household interest, taking in Scotland and Ireland, has therefore the power of the empire in its hands. But let us suppose a case. If it were desirable to a certain number of capitalists to carry any measure, to annihilate the House of Lords, to repudiate the national debt, or establish the Pope at St. Paul's, we doubt not means could be found under the present system to accomplish it. First, large sums of money must be collected, then the intentions of the House of Commons must be sounded ; perhaps from twenty to fifty members might vote in a minority on the first division, and the proposition be rejected with laughter. After a while, however, some might turn a serious attention to the business, and a party would be formed. As Whig and Tory are nearly equally balanced, the new party, like the Leaguers, would be respected as giving weight to one or the other ; so that a ministry would find it necessary to flatter them in order to preserve its existence. When a general election comes, then the monied party have their real weight ; there are in every town numbers who notoriously sell their votes ; these, say 200 each, in 200 boroughs, would be enough to turn a scale and unseat a ministry ; so that there is nothing to prevent the worst portion of the electors being the real rulers of England. Of course this may seem to be an extreme case, but it is what the League have *actually done* ; *they have turned a scale in the House of Com-*

mons by means of money and agitation, and so gained their own ends in an attack upon property, in opposition to the Lords, and without hindrance from the Crown. Mr. Cobden, like Jugurtha, seemed to consider the State as set up for sale, and that contested elections were his market; he brought his money and his freeholders to bear upon the council of the State and public opinion, and he was able to carry his point. It is unreasonable to complain of purchased seats, nomination boroughs, and corrupt electors, under the old system, when the most active reformers carry out the same principle to a greater extent.

There is nothing new in this connexion of democracy and insecurity; history teaches us that they have always gone together. The Athenians never allowed a fellow citizen to grow rich; if he were beyond his neighbours, they taxed him with an order to fit out "two galleys and a tender," or compelled him to provide the expense of a theatrical exhibition. The free citizen must either submit, or point out another citizen who was richer than himself. If the second denied the fact, he could be obliged to exchange property with the first. All this was done on democratic principles; here is one who has property, but the people have votes, and the good of the majority is the supreme advantage. So far had this system proceeded, that one of the comic poets represents a citizen as telling his friend, that he was determined to eat and drink as fast as he could, as he never considered his property secure until he had swallowed it.

But our opponents will reply, "Democracy certainly injures the security of the rich, but it adds to the security of the poor—see what cheap bread can do." Now this, also, we deny: the poor man may have no property to lose, but he has his employment; and, what is more valuable than either, he has his life; and the abrogation of the royal functions has been attended with want of security for life as well as for property. It is a rule of our constitution that "the king can do no wrong:" now one meaning of this is, that he has a right to act on an emergency without being responsible afterwards. In war, for instance, the constitution gives the king immense powers, only limited by the necessity of asking supplies from the Commons. This sovereignty is intended for the security of all, and in less civilized times it was often necessary to use it, and to anticipate or repel force by force. There are, however, other calamities equally destructive as war. The loss of the potato crop in Ireland in 1846 left three or four millions of her Majesty's poorest subjects without their expected food, and whole provinces were likely to be in a state of utter destitution. Here, then, was an emergency: the Romans would have created a dictator; and the old constitution of England had provided a remedy—the king ought to act. The king, being.

placed above responsibility, represents the whole body of his subjects, and would naturally act for the interest of all. He can have the advice of all classes and creeds, and of both sides of the house, while a prime minister cannot be advised by his political opponents. George the Third was one who knew his own place, and would have acted on it. He could, with the advice of the best political economists of the day, have obtained the best information, and taken the most strenuous measures. Supposing the proposal had cost one or two millions, if the king had raised the money, and by this means saved the nation from famine, the Commons must have granted the supply when called on ; or, if not, an appeal to the people to support the king would have given him any Parliament he pleased, and the only danger would have been that over-popularity might make him too absolute. When George the Third once found his cabinet refractory, he threatened to send for thirteen respectable gentlemen to supply their places, and then, said he, " I shall ask my people whether they choose to be governed by you or by me."

But how stood the case in 1846? In a reformed Parliament, our elected king, Lord John Russell, must first be returned by the London merchants before he can direct the councils of the nation ; he, therefore, represents but a small section of the community, and, of course, having no government borough to fall back upon, he speaks the sentiments of his constituents. He talks of not interfering with mercantile speculation—that demand will produce adequate supply, that sound principles of political economy tell us we must not force a market lest we discourage regular merchants, and that in the end there will always be enough. Sir Robert Peel acted much more wisely (he represented a private borough)—he ordered certain supplies in a quiet way, which provided against the partial failure of 1845. It is an axiom with us, that a minister can never be a king in the proper acceptation of the word. It is part of his business to answer questions, he is subject to misrepresentation in parliament, and in the newspapers ; so that, when an emergency arises, the time for action is often lost in consultation, or sounding the disposition of the House. Thus the unity of the executive, one of our great constitutional advantages, is lost.

A joint-stock company, a religious society, or a charitable institution, always flourishes or retrogrades in proportion to the acts and ability of the secretary. The working man, who can have the whole subject in his mind, who can bring matters properly before the committee, and both advise them and carry out their plans, is the real king of the society. Though he must be restrained by public opinion, yet it is his duty to give a proper

tone to that opinion, and, when he has ascertained it, to carry out the views of his friends in the best way. If, however, a society should determine that their secretary shall have no power, that he shall be changed every year, and if they are afraid that he will do too much, we should soon find the exertions of the society crippled, and their objects unsteadily carried out. Security, then, depending on the power of the Crown to meet an emergency, and to prevent one subject, or class of subjects, from encroaching on the rights of another, has been very much diminished. As we have not yet attained to universal suffrage or the ballot, we have not ventured upon repudiation or open confiscation; but, while we have approached more closely to the ultra-democratic principle, we have fallen under some of the losses attendant on it.

The passing of the Reform Bill, by which these changes were effected, is one of the most interesting passages in Miss Martineau's history; the popular cry, the sudden dissolution of Parliament by the unexpected arrival of William IV. during a debate on the 22nd of April, 1831, while the peers were in the act of preparing a remonstrance against it; "the waverers" in the House of Lords; the question, first, "What will the Lords do?" and, afterwards, "What must be done with the Lords?" and, finally, the advice of Lord Grey to the king to create peers in order to pass the Bill;—all these are matters which Miss Martineau relates with the greatest zest. For our part, we confess, we look back upon these events as among the most unfortunate which ever befell the nation. De Lolme's motto, "*Ponderibus librata suis*," no longer applies to the British Constitution; two estates of the realm combined to destroy the weight of the third, or rather the king was induced by a desire of popularity to throw away the trust committed to him for the good of his subjects. This the peers foresaw; and the Duke of Wellington asked the question, "But, my lords, How is the king's government to be carried on?" Nearly twenty years' experience enables us to answer the question; it is not carried on: a new form of government is introduced, new kings are elected and dethroned in each succeeding Parliament, and while the people glory in their imaginary rights they have really gained nothing in liberty, while they have lost much in the security and value of their property.

Louis Philippe went a step further than William IV.: one of his first acts was to create peers to destroy the hereditary peerage; and the event has shown that his unconstitutional act has destroyed his throne, while an unconstitutional threat has weakened the Crown of England. The royal prerogative of creating peers now merges in the prime minister, thus giving a subject a

terrible degree of power. He may at any time use the king's name to annihilate the power of the Upper House, if the Commons have so decreed. Miss Martineau relates, with the greatest satisfaction, O'Connell's agitation for an elective house of peers; the various motions for the expulsion of the bishops; and Mr. Hume's modest proposition that the lords should only be allowed to delay the progress of a measure for one session, and that the royal assent should be given to a bill as soon as it had passed the Commons a second time. (See vol. ii. p. 258, &c.)

Miss Martineau confesses that reform is a failure. On this subject she writes thus:—

“There were men among the working classes, sound-headed and sound-hearted, wanting nothing but a wider social knowledge and experience to make them fit and safe guides for their order (some few of them not deficient even in these), who saw that the Reform Bill was, if not a failure in itself, a failure in regard to the popular expectation from it. If it was not all that its framers meant it to be, they must give a supplement.”

We have, then, an extract from Carlyle's “Chartism,” in which he shows that, in a reformed Parliament, the same questions and struggles go on as before:—

“What ministry should be in office, game laws, Irish affairs, usury laws, African blacks,” &c., &c.

He is surprised that the real representatives of the people cannot remedy the evils under which the people suffer; and this Miss Martineau adds in conclusion:—

“These men wanted a strong, steady-going progression; and they would have therefore neither the pomp and prancings of Toryism, nor the incapacity of Whiggism. They were Radical Reformers.”—Vol. ii. p. 264.

The fallacy here, that any body of representatives can effect impossibilities; the extreme folly of expecting a redress of natural evils by the force of legislation; the mistake that better members must be found by universal suffrage than by representation of interests, are too clear to require refutation. France has universal suffrage; but are the people more secure, more religious, more wealthy, or more content?

But the cry is still with Miss Martineau and her admirers, “Give us progress and equal rights, extend the franchise, let no man be unrepresented, but let every one who pays taxes (or who does not) have a voice in their disposal.” Now we say, Represent every class in the community; but the indiscriminate extension of the franchise may be a curse and not a blessing: it is the very means by which *classes are not represented*, as other interests are swal-

lowed up in numbers. The difference, says De Lolme, between a popular government (like Athens) and a representative one is, that "a popular government places the power in the hands of those who cause the disorder; a representative government places it in the hands of those who feel the disorder." Now the extension of the franchise, as in great towns, often puts the power into the hands of the popular man, the man who talks loudest and gives the most trouble; and thus, as in the case of the Anti-Corn-Law League, members were returned to Parliament to legislate on the very commotion which they themselves had created. Here the franchise, instead of serving the State or the holder, only serves the orator who makes a tool of the elector for his own purpose. The householder is taught for the time to consider himself a great man, and he is led into drunkenness, bribery, perjury, and every species of demoralization, if it will only secure the return of the aspirant to parliamentary honours. This is, of course, only an abuse, and is no argument against the lawful use of the privilege. True; but what we want to show is, that extension of suffrage is not the way to reform a nation: it has its crying evils as well as its advantages.

Besides, at this moment, the Whigs are endeavouring to force thousands into the strife of political controversy, who have hitherto shrunk from it, and repudiated the boon. The Irish tenant farmers have been so unwilling to register, that many of them have refused leases, and the Irish constituencies have greatly fallen away. A bill is now before Parliament to make the poor-rate the test of the franchise, and to register each occupier, valued at 8*l.*, without consulting him; thus forcing the unfortunate tenant to vote either against the landlord or the priest; or rather giving the Roman Catholic priests the power, on the day of election, of driving them to the poll like a flock of sheep³. Of all the arrangements ever proposed for a starving and disorganized country, this seems to be the most monstrous. It has never even been asked for, and would be deeply regretted by the unfortunate men to whom the privilege is given, and does much more harm than a sweeping measure of the kind in England. At present Ireland is quite incapable of understanding her own interests. English radicals and manufacturers saw, or thought they saw, a benefit in repealing the corn-laws; but the Irish tenant farmers only did what the priests de-

³ Mr. Bright, seeing this difficulty, lately proposed the ballot as a remedy. To this we answer by a quotation from Mitford's "Greece," which disposes of the subject very concisely. "Alcibiades, being asked if he could not trust his country, replied, 'Yes, for every thing else: but, in a trial for life, not my mother; lest, by mistake, she put a black bean for a white one.' Whatever authority there be for this anecdote, it contains a very just reproof of the Athenian mode of giving judgment on life and death by a secret ballot, which, without preventing corruption, admits mistake, excludes responsibility, and covers shame." (Vol. iii. p. 459.)

sired them. The landed interest presented a barrier between the Roman Catholic Church and the rule of the country, and this they were determined, at all hazards, to pull down. They, therefore, told the freeholders that it was a religious question; the people believed (like all Roman Catholics) that they must obey their spiritual superior in all spiritual matters, and, when their landlords reasoned with them on the destruction they were bringing upon their own trade, the answer was, "Give us a big loaf and high wages." Ireland, therefore, has no right to complain of the late changes in the price of corn; she herself voted against protection, more than half the Irish members sided with the Whigs, and if the Irish constituencies chose to throw away their own market for the benefit of foreigners, and at the teaching of the Pope, they have no one to blame but themselves and their advisers. Where the blame really lies is upon those who create constituencies unqualified to understand their own interests, and who, in the endeavour to destroy the undue influence of the nobility in electing representatives, have given greater power to those who have less interest in the general welfare.

To prove our assertion, we need only take the example of the proposer of the Irish Franchise Bill, now before Parliament, by which he intends to raise the number of voters in a tenfold ratio. Sir William Somerville, the chief secretary for Ireland, has, for the last two or three Parliaments, represented the town of Drogheda, with a constituency of about 700. As he is one of those politicians who would govern Ireland through the priests, and as he resides close to the town which he represents, we should suppose him well qualified to express the opinions of his constituents, except that, unfortunately, he happens to be a gentleman. When the present Government came into office, he was appointed chief secretary,—a position which gives him the management of the local administration at Dublin Castle, and also the best patronage in the kingdom. Here, then, were abundant places for needy constituents, and we should have expected to have heard of Drogheda men or their sons in all the small places under the Crown. The police, the excise, the government stores would naturally have opened for the sons and brothers of the secretary's constituents. We cannot blame a minister for thus playing into the hands of those who support him; he owes his political existence, not to the Crown, but to the electors of a borough; and, therefore, they must be his first object. Now, to carry out the views of those who are represented, a voice in the Government is worth twenty votes in the House, and we might have thought Sir William's supporters would have been satisfied; but it was not so. As soon as Parliament was dissolved, one of his friends waited on him, *and told him he must have a certain number of places, with*

certain salaries annexed, or Sir William must expect to lose his seat. Here is again the fatal mistake of reform: the powers of the executive are left at the mercy of the rabble; the acceptance of office vacates a seat, and, if the new minister be turned out of his former place, the Crown has no power to provide him with another. Inefficient officers are thus often appointed because their seats are secure. Sir William Somerville, as an honest man, could not swallow the pledge, a violent opposition was got up in favour of a stranger unknown in the town before, and the chief secretary was only returned by a majority of two. He would have lost his seat, as the Conservative party intended not to vote; but a few gentlemen took pity on him, and came forward to support him within half an hour of the close of the poll. We should have thought such an election would have been a lesson to the Irish secretary, but we fear no experience will teach a Whig to forego a little temporary popularity.

As to the second species of government, an aristocracy, whose end is wealth, there has been some loss occasioned by reform, but not to the same degree as in the destruction of the power of the Crown. The Reform Bill left great weight with the aristocracy; but this was because, in the very nature of things, wealth and knowledge must confer power. The division of the counties and the Chandos clause (at which Miss Martineau is very angry) gave a counterbalance to the small tenures in towns, and the counties now return the aristocratic members instead of the boroughs. This leaves matters pretty much as they were; but one element which favours wealth has been omitted, we mean corporate representation. For this, numerical suffrage has been substituted. Corporations were originally intended to encourage and protect industry; serving an apprenticeship was a very common title to freedom: thus corporate interests, particular trades (ship-builders, cotton-spinners, wool-staplers, &c., according to the different manufactures of the towns), were supposed to be represented in the legislature. Corporations certainly had fallen into the hands of individuals; these were generally rich proprietors who spent money on the improvement of the town, and expected the corporation to lend them parliamentary influence in return. Jobs were often thus managed, but we believe the reformed corporations understand jobbing quite as well; the new electors are quite as open to bribery, and in many places municipal taxation is increased. Though reform has done its part to take away the representation of interests, there are still certain interests which force themselves into the House. The East India Company, for instance, are obliged to have some of their directors in Parliament, and instead of the old plan they buy a few hundred electors in some corrupt borough, where the inhabitants are anxious to

set up a contest. It is remarkable that the two members for *Salisbury* twenty years ago were two of the great bankers of *Calcutta*; so that the most rotten borough in England actually represented the monied interests of India, and perhaps twenty or thirty millions of his majesty's subjects.

Parliament is not the real place of representation; the true representation is in the cabinet. Here trade, India, the colonies, foreign relations, the government at home and in Ireland, are all sufficiently represented by men who really understand their subjects; and this is the real ground on which all great questions are decided. We have heard a very high character of the respectability and dignity of the American senate. Now this assembly (their upper house) are neither more nor less than the representatives of the States in their corporate capacity. Each local government sends two senators to Congress; and these men, though a weak body as compared with the house of representatives, yet seem to command the respect of the better class of their countrymen, which the popular assembly certainly does not. The outcry against rotten boroughs arose from the fact that a single individual, like the Duke of Newcastle, could send six or eight members to the House of Commons, and that therefore he could carry certain points with the Government for his own private benefit; he was a monopolist—he could sell the freedom of England, and had too much power for a free and enlightened country.

Now we ask, Were not O'Connell and Cobden quite as extensive borough-mongers as any great lord before reform? The only difference between them and the former monopolist is, that the one served themselves openly and avowedly; and the others did so in the name of the people, whom they kept in agitation in order to retain their influence. If we might propose a new species of reform, we should say that the best measure would be to disfranchise all boroughs where corruption is proved, and then give the members to the old and respectable corporations. We mean the East India Company, the Bank of England, the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons. Afterwards the railway interests might be incorporated for the purposes of the franchise. These great bodies must be heard in Parliament: and the only question is, whether they shall be heard unfairly by buying corrupt electors; or whether they shall have a legal and honest right given them to that which they already possess. We have but three corporations now remaining in possession of the franchise; and these afford the six best and most respectable seats in the House—we mean the three Universities. This is the only instance where old privilege was spared, and where local and numerical suffrage did not supersede intelligence and qualification. We do not see why *knowledge of medicine and surgery* should not be as good a title

to the franchise as a degree in arts; the medical profession is now in the greatest difficulties for want of proper legislation, on subjects which few but professional men can understand. We believe that the possession of Bank Stock or East Indian securities (both requiring regulation by law) will give quite as good an interest in the welfare of the State as a ten-pound household which requires no such legal protection. Wherever, then, the householders disqualify themselves (as many do at least once in seven years), let another qualification be sought; there will still be boroughs enough left to represent the class of householders, and several great interests will be brought into direct consideration which are now only indirectly or unfairly represented. As the third object in government is liberty, and as this is the great benefit to be expected from democracy, let us consider whether, in our evident losses on the other two points, we have gained an equivalent in the third. Before reform we believe England was perfectly free. The king could not interfere with private rights; and, if Parliament did so, they always awarded compensation. The inherent weakness of the ancient democracy was such, that at Rome and Sparta the people were obliged to create a class of magistrates for their own protection, who became in the end the greatest tyrants. The Tribunes, and the Ephori, being protected personally by law, soon abused their power, and became corrupt in the exercise of their trust. Now, as the British Constitution gives us each of the great features of the ancient republics, we also have our protecting magistrates chosen for the people, and not by them: we mean the judges. They are officially independent, though personally responsible. A judge can be prosecuted for an assault (if such a thing could happen) though he can administer the law to rich and poor alike, and the whole power of the State is bound to support his decision. This great bulwark of constitutional liberty existed long before reform, and when a reformed House of Commons attempted to interfere with it, the whole democracy of England, with Sir Robert Peel at its head, was defeated by Lord Denman, on the question of breach of privilege. This steady execution of the law is the real safeguard of our liberties, and we should wish to be informed upon the point as to what greater degree of liberty honest men require than the English enjoyed before the year 1832.

De Lolme's definition of liberty, quoted above, includes the fact, that every one must respect the rights of his neighbour; and in this sense the effect of all the late democratic movements has been to diminish liberty. When at Paris, in 1848, an English lady saw her coachman shot on her carriage, because he was an Englishman; the only answer she received from the police was, "Madam, have you not seen the proclamation? It

is the will of the people that no foreign servants be employed." When, at the same period, a gentleman was removing his property to London, he was only allowed to take a small portion of his plate, for the will of the people did not allow property to be removed from France.

Liberty does not consist in the power of insulting our neighbours, or wearing our hats in public places, or abusing others anonymously through the medium of the press. Where each man can enjoy his property and his rights, he is truly free. Americans consider it a violation of freedom when they are not allowed to beat their own niggers; and Frenchmen left us a lasting burlesque on liberty when they cut down the trees which ornamented the Boulevards of Paris, and planted them to wither under tri-coloured garlands. A few foolish fellows might be seen dancing round them, and crying, "Vive la république!" but this affords a striking exemplification of those who seek for a mistaken liberty by destroying our constitution. The tree has made progress certainly; but its beauty, usefulness, and stability are gone, and the old fabric of the British Constitution which sheltered our fathers is exchanged for temporary excitement. The radical press, the great enemy of true liberty, calumniating every thing good and virtuous at a penny a line, are the interest who really gain by the commotion. The newspaper editor, whose stock in trade consists in a few unmeaning phrases, is either to be the public instructor, or a member of a provisional government; and thus, while a phantom is pursued, the reality is lost.

Every nation must be led by somebody. The question is, Shall it be by the king or a minister? by the Duke of Wellington or by Fergus O'Connor? From the latter alternative, and the evils of the French revolution, nothing saved us but the providence of God, who gave firmness to the Duke of Wellington and good sense to the citizens of London. The natural step from the licentiousness of a mob is to a military despotism, and the extreme of liberty ends in its total loss. A few interested persons, like the orators of Athens, or the revolutionary writers of the present day, get up a disturbance in order to profit by it themselves. They enjoy the excitement, and gratify their jealousy against their superiors. The freedom of opinion and the liberty of the press are watchwords which sound well, when in reality the liberty claimed is only the privilege of injuring others. We must recollect, that while the democracy of Athens has left us the orations of Demosthenes and the comedies of Aristophanes, the benefit has been reaped by the rest of the world, while the citizens lived in continual fear of each other, and the ballot of the model republic condemned Socrates to die.

It is *hardly fair to an author* to close a review without, at

least, a specimen of the style of the book, and we select a striking passage. It will give our readers a true idea of her talents as a writer, which are considerable; and her feelings as a politician, which are unfair. The advocate of progress cannot help sneering at those who desire to uphold the institutions of the country, while the striking scene which we have chosen gives great scope for description. It is the death and funeral of the Duke of York.

“The Duke of York was the first who was withdrawn. The Lord Chancellor saw much of him for some weeks before his death; and the chancellor’s opinion was, that his thoughts were almost exclusively occupied by the Catholic question, and the dread in regard to that question of the ascendancy of Mr. Canning. In Lord Eldon’s own opinion, his existence was essential to the effectual counteraction of Mr. Canning’s influence, and to his displacement from the councils of the king. ‘His death,’ declares Lord Eldon, ‘must affect every man’s political situation, perhaps nobody’s more than my own; it may shorten, it may prolong my stay in office.’ Of course, Mr. Canning himself must have known, as well as other people, the importance of the life that had gone, the significance of the death that had arrived. It must have been with a singular mixture of feelings, that a man of his patriotism and power of will, and of his magnanimity and sensibility, must have bent over the vault in St. George’s Chapel, into whose darkness, amidst the blaze of torches, the body of his arch-enemy was descending. It was then and there that he took his own death,—perhaps at the moment when he was thinking how quiet in that resting-place at the goal of every human career, where the small and the great lie down together, and ‘princes and counsellors of the earth,’ like his foe and himself, are quiet, and sleep after their warfare. If those who attended the funeral could have seen their own position, between the past and the future, as we see it now, it would have so absorbed all their thoughts, that the body might have been lowered into its vault unseen, and the funeral anthems have been unheard. A more singular assemblage than the doomed group about the mouth of that vault has seldom been seen. In virtue of our survivorship, we can observe them now, each one with his fate hovering over his uncovered head. He who was next to be lowered into that vault was not there. He was in his palace, weak in health and spirits,—relieved, and yet perplexed, that the course of government was simplified by the removal of his remonstrant brother, whose plea of nearness to the throne—now so solemnly set aside—had made his interference at once irksome and difficult to disregard. There would be no more interference now, no more painful audiences, no more letters brought in with that familiar superscription. The way was clear now; but to what? Liverpool and Canning must settle that. If they felt that the Catholic question must be settled, they must show how it was to be done, and they must do it. Liverpool and Canning! By that day twelvemonth how was it with them? Lord Liverpool was not at Windsor that night. He laid down his care-worn

head to rest, unaware that but a few more days of life (as he considered life) remained to him. The body breathed for some months, but in a few days after this the mind was dead. As for Canning,—his heart and his mind were full as his noble brow shone in the torch-light. He well knew that it was not only his chief personal enemy who was here laid low, but the only insurmountable barrier to his policy! He saw an open course before him, or one which he himself could clear. He saw the foul fiend Revolution descend into that vault, to be sealed down in it with that coffin. He saw beyond that torch-lit chapel a vision of Ireland tranquillized; and the hope rose within him that he might achieve a peace at home, the sound peace of freedom—as blessed as the peace which he had spread over the world abroad. And all the time the chill and damps of that chapel, dim amidst the yellow glare with the night fog of January, were poisoning his vitals and shortening his allowance of life to a mere span. Beside him stood his friend and comrade Huskisson. They were born in the same spring; they were neither of them to know another moment of health, after this chilly night service; and their deaths were to be not far apart. What remained for both were the bitter last drops of the cup of life; sickness, toil, perplexity, some humiliation, and infinite anguish. Here, if they had known their future, they would have laid down all self-regards, all ambition, all hope and mirth, all thoughts of finished work and a serene old age, and have gone forth to do and suffer the last stage of their service, before drooping into their untimely rest. These two had made no professions of grief about the death of the prince: they did not vaunt their feelings; yet here they were, sad and solemn; while beside them stood one whose woes about the loss of his royal friend, and about the irreparable loss to the empire, were paraded before all men's eyes, and dinned into the ears of all who would listen. Here stood Lord Chancellor Eldon, beside the open grave in which he declared that the hopes of his country were being buried. Was he lost in grief? his ready tears in fuller flow than ever? his soul absorbed in patriotic meditation? 'Lord Eldon recollecting'—what? that he might catch cold—stood upon his hat, to avoid the chill from the flags: and 'his precaution was completely successful.' ”

(We think the old gentleman was quite right to take care of his health, whatever opinion Liberals may have formed.)

“If it had but occurred to Canning to stand upon his hat! but he was thinking of other things. There were others for whom death was in waiting; and some for whom great labours and deeds were preparing in life: the troublesome opponent of ministers, Mr. Tierney, who was to be found dead in his study before the next royal funeral; and Lord Graves, who was to die by his own hand under the provocation of royal vice or levity. And what tasks lay before those who were to live and work! Among the six dukes who bore the pall, was he who was to succeed to the highest military office now thus vacated: and Wellington himself, no doubt, thought this night that he was of one mind in the great *political questions of the day* with the prince whose pall he bore.

No doubt he believed that he should, in his proper place, do what he could to exclude the Catholics, and to keep the conscience of the sovereign fixed upon the coronation oath, and his duty to Protestantism:—in his proper place, we say, because the duke spurned the idea of a military chief, like himself, taking civil office, and openly declared, with indignation at an unfounded rumour, that he should be mad if he dreamed of the premiership. Yet, before this royal vault should again be opened, Wellington was to be premier, and use his office to repeal the disabilities of the Catholics. Truly, pledges and prophecies are dangerous things for statesmen to meddle with in times of transition: and it would seem to be a main feature in the mission of the honest and resolute Wellington, honest and resolute beyond all cavil, to prove the presumption of pledges and prophecies in times of transition. Then there was Peel, with the same work before him, and much more of which he had not yet begun to dream; and with the fate before him of losing his best beloved honour, the representation of his university, and gaining several others, any one of which would suffice to make an immortality. And there was Hardinge, the friend of both the deceased and the incoming commander-in-chief, who was to signalize his age in the history of India by his administration and achievements both in peace and war. And there was, as chief mourner, he who was to be our next king, and in whose reign was to occur that vital renovation of our representative system, which will be to thoughtful students a thousand years hence what Magna Charta is to us. What a group was here collected within the curtain of the future, seeing nothing but the vault at their feet and the banners of the past waving above their heads, and wherever they thought they saw their way into coming time, seeing wrongly, mistaking their own fancy painting on the curtain for the discernment of that which was behind it. And behind that veil agents were at work unheard; death at his grave-digging, and the people with their demands and acclamations, and the trumpet-voice of conviction summoning prejudice to surrender. But what they saw not we as survivors see; and what they heard not we hear; for now that curtain of futurity is hung up over our heads as banners of the past; and the summons of death, and of the popular will and of individual conscience, are still audible to us, not in their first stunning crash, but as funeral echoes to which those banners float.”—Vol. i. p. 430.

Of course any recognition of God's over-ruling Providence, that “by Him kings reign and princes decree justice,” that it is the God of heaven and earth, “who stilleth the noise of the waves and the madness of the people,” but sometimes allows progress as the punishment of presumption, are all antiquated prejudices which modern liberalism altogether disclaims. To Miss Martineau the people are a God, their will is the supreme law, and death is the eternal sleep which is to close the scene upon the great and good. So solemn an occasion as the funeral of an expectant king, we have no doubt, called up very different feelings from those above described; and, if it did not, it is only

another proof of the utter vanity of all worldly ambition, and the misery of those who in this world only have hope. As Miss Martineau's two quarto volumes are large and expensive, they carry the best antidote to their own evil. The book is not likely to have much circulation among the less-educated classes, and we hope that a little attentive consideration will enable her readers to take what is really valuable, because it is true, and leave what is dangerous, because it disguises revolution under specious expressions.

We would respectfully ask Miss Martineau what she means by progress? Is she an advocate for communism, anarchy, and repudiation? if not, what is it that she desires, and where are we to stop? Of course she wishes to remove the bishops from the House of Lords: does she wish to include the whole house in a schedule of disfranchisement? She wishes for all religions to be on an equality, destroying of course the property of the Established Church: does she propose to respect the property of the laity, including the Funds and copyright? She is anxious for education without bigotry: does she propose to exclude the Bible and religion from our schools? She wishes for an extension of the franchise (this is popular and seems to mean something): is she an advocate for universal suffrage? and, if so, are women to have votes in the new commonwealth? She does not approve of their admission to the gallery of the House of Commons, though she wishes to see them organized in clubs and literary societies. In short, we call for a definition of her favourite term "Progress," we want to know whither we are going. If England could see, as we have endeavoured to show, that under a democracy property is insecure, a reaction must at once take place; but we fear things must go farther before this is clearly seen. For our own part, we feel that progress has gone too far already, and that many of its advocates, like the Tories who advocated reform, or the farmers who shouted for cheap bread, do not know what they are asking for. We wish we could see an agitation in England to restore the legitimate power of the Crown, as upon it depends much of our social liberty, and where we have diminished it we have lost the constitutional element for the protection of the nation against sudden emergencies, and for the security of property at home.

- ART. IV.—1. *The Doctrine of the Church of England, as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants. With an Appendix, containing the Baptismal Services of Luther and the Nuremburg and Cologne Liturgies. By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Allhallows the Great and Less, London. Second Edition. Hatchards: London.*
2. *The Doctrine of Holy Baptism, with Remarks on the Rev. W. Goode's "Effects of Infant Baptism." By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. London: Murray.*
3. *The Argument of Dr. Bayford in behalf of the Rev. G. C. Gorham, in the Arches Court of Canterbury. London: Seeleys.*
4. *Church Matters in MDCCCL. No. 1. Trial of Doctrines. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. Oxford and London: J. H. Parker.*
5. *A First Letter on the present position of the High Church Party in the Church of England. By the Rev. WILLIAM MASKELL, Vicar of St. Mary Church. The Royal Supremacy and the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. London: Pickering.*
6. *Bishop Jewell on the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper. London: Rivingtons.*
7. *Baptismal Regeneration, &c. By the Rev. G. TOWNSEND, D.D., &c. London: Rivingtons.*
8. *The Opponents of Baptismal Regeneration Solemnly Warned, &c. By the Rev. W. B. BARTER. London: Rivingtons.*
9. *A Scriptural View of the Rites of Baptism. By JEREMIAH JACKSON, M.A., Rector of Elm with Emneth. London: J. W. Parker.*
10. *The Doctrine of Holy Baptism Explained. By the Rev. C. E. DOUGLAS, B.A., Curate of Brighton. Brighton: King.*
11. *Suggestions to Minds Perplexed by the Gorham Case. A Sermon. By the Rev. W. SEWELL, B.D., &c.*

THE decision of the Committee of Privy Council having been given in the Gorham case, we feel more at liberty to speak freely and fully on the various topics connected with this serious subject, than we did in the course of the legal investigations which have issued so far in the decision of the judicial Committee of Council. We hope that we shall be enabled to speak on the question with the calmness which its deep import-

ance requires, though it may be difficult to preserve the tone of mind in which it ought to be approached, in the midst of the extreme excitement which it has not unnaturally created; and which is united with an evidently unsettled state of opinion in some cases, and with habits of bold action and decision on partial consideration of questions, which the controversies of late years have, unfortunately, tended to foster; and also with a tendency to extreme and overstrained views on some points, in which men easily deviate into error, and in which the course of truth is marked by no such broad and striking features that "he who runs may read."

The case is, indeed, one of no ordinary difficulty; and though we have the fullest and most unshaken confidence that the truth will in the end be vindicated; and that the course of those who hold the truth in the many difficult and complex questions before us, will become more plain than it may seem to them at present, when, confessedly, matters are in a state of great complexity; yet we must, undoubtedly, look in great anxiety at the course which may be taken by some members of the Church; and, although we are aware that our suggestions are not likely to receive much attention in the quarters referred to, we would yet entreat on behalf of the Church of England, that if, indeed, there be that filial attachment to her, which has been ere now in some degree professed, and which is undoubtedly due to the Church which has administered to us the sacrament of regeneration—if there be any remaining loyalty to the Church of England, and the love once borne to her has not turned into gall and bitterness, under the influence of disappointment and fear—that she should not now be condemned, and delivered unto Satan as one that is faithless to her Redeemer's cause—that the desertion of her wayward children may not add to her affliction—and that no heart fail for fear lest the cause of Catholic and Apostolic truth be overcome, or believe that it is to be overcome in the Church of England.

Why should the Church of England be now regarded with a different feeling from what she was a year ago? Were there not many persons within her communion then, who taught unsound doctrine on the point of baptismal regeneration? Have there not been various persons—nay, clergymen—who broadly and openly denied regeneration in any sense in Baptism? And have not those persons been permitted to remain in possession of benefices? Have not even Bishops been uncertain on that doctrine? And yet have they not remained in their sees? It is a simple fact, that for many years there have been large numbers of clergy, who have denied the doctrine of the Church of England in this matter, and have, in various and contradictory ways, attempted to explain *her formularies* in accordance with their views, or

have sought for their alteration. Well—it may be, that the question ought to have been long ago brought to the test of some ecclesiastical tribunal, and that the defenders of the Church's doctrine ought not to have satisfied themselves as they did with mere controversy; but still they may well be excused for the course they took. They, perhaps, were of opinion that controversy, in so very plain a matter, in which their own cause was so triumphant in point of argument, was sufficient. They trusted to the force of truth; the heads of the Church did not deem it necessary to interfere; and others were unwilling to take the movement out of their hands.

We do not mean to deny that the decision of the Committee of Council gives the sanction of the temporal power, as far as it goes, to the continuance of teaching at variance with the formularies of the Church. The temporal power declares, that in *its* judgment the difference is not such in this case as to prevent both parties holding office in the Church of England. The temporal power decides *in its own favour*, the presentee to the vacant living being presented by a functionary of the temporal power; and it naturally opens the doors as wide as it possibly can to admit those whom it may nominate to the possession of the temporalities which it bestows.

We do not see what the Church of England has *now* done to alter her position. From whatever cause, there has been for some time a division on certain points, especially on the question of regeneration. We are far from saying or thinking that truth is exclusively on one side of the question, in the various matters under discussion. We think that there have been faults in both directions; that the one party has disputed the teaching of the Church on regeneration, and that some on the other side have not adequately received her teaching on election and final perseverance. But we certainly do not see how it is possible, consistently with justice, to affirm that the Church of England has spoken in the late decision of the Committee of Council, and affirmed that she sanctions contradictory doctrines. We know it is easy for malice to misrepresent her position, or for excited feeling to misapprehend it; but the only real change in her position is, that it is now ascertained that the present Court, to which the State devolves its supreme power in Church matters, has decided that the doctrines which have been so long taught with impunity in the Church shall still be taught with impunity; that the plain and evident meaning of the formularies of the Church, and the evident intentions of the compilers, shall still be perverted by the evasions and subtleties by which men have hitherto been enabled to continue to teach doctrines contrary to them.

The formularies of the Church remain as they were a year

since, when it was affirmed, by all who upheld the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, that they distinctly taught that doctrine. Are those formularies changed, or is their meaning now different from what it then was? The Committee of Council has, from whatever motives or reasons, placed a wrong interpretation on those formularies, and has in its action frustrated the effort to maintain the evident doctrine of those formularies. But all that results from the matter is this, that the Church has not at this moment the power of expelling false doctrine on the point referred to, by any appeal to the Committee of Privy Council. It remains however to be seen what course she must pursue for the maintenance of the truth which is enshrined in her formularies. The present is only one item in the series of difficulties which are continually and increasingly presenting themselves in the present relations of the Church with the temporal power. The Church of England is now involved in great difficulties, having before her the difficult task of managing the controversy within herself on the very important questions involved in the predestinarian doctrine, and at the same time of defending herself from the aggressions, or rather from the abuse of power (originally granted under different circumstances), which must be expected from the State. We are placed in circumstances, as a Church, in which party spirit is greatly to be deprecated; in which angry feelings should be, as far as possible, removed; and in which sound heads and sound hearts, firm faith, patience, and courageous perseverance, are eminently requisite, not merely to maintain one particular doctrine from being denied, but to retain the deposit of the faith in all points, and to obtain such reasonable securities as shall enable the Church to go on her way undisturbed by the attempts of worldly men to render her the tool and agent of their earthly ends, and to induce her to cease from her office of proclaiming the truth of God. We deeply regret the existence of that party spirit, which precludes co-operation for common objects. The Church cannot without such co-operation remain in her present position in the country.

In offering the preceding remarks, we have been addressing ourselves chiefly to those who may have been, in some degree, disturbed and confused by the recent decision in the Gorham case, but who have been always really attached to the Church of England, and are not disposed in a captious spirit to avail themselves of every possible circumstance to throw discredit on their spiritual mother. We are anxious to retain such faithful members of the Church—men of sincerity, of piety, and of Christian zeal; but we must confess that we do not think the Church would lose any thing by the secession of some of her members, whose *usefulness is marred by conceit and arrogance*, and

whose first thought in any difficulty is to suggest disloyal feelings towards the Church of England. Such men we cannot recognize as friends or allies in the cause of the Church. Their co-operation always causes embarrassment, and their desertion is deferred to the moment when it is calculated to do most harm. The Church has certainly no reason to wish for their continuance in her communion, in their actual frame of mind. If they leave us, we shall lament it for their sakes, but not for the sake of the Church of England. They may go out from us, but they are not of us.

In proceeding to the consideration of the principal points of the Gorham case, we shall, in the first place, consider the ground taken by Mr. Gorham, and the various arguments employed to support it; and, subsequently, pass to the judgment lately delivered, and its bearing upon the Church of England.

The doctrine maintained by Mr. Gorham is doubtless familiar to our readers generally. He admits that regeneration takes place sometimes in infancy. But he asserts that the baptismal offices must always be understood as expressing the judgment of charity when they speak of regeneration as conferred in baptism. He argues that, as regeneration does not always accompany the rite in adults, so it does not always in the case of infants—that it always supposes an act of prevenient grace. Thus, then, he denies that all infants are regenerated in baptism; and, though he does not himself openly assert the doctrine, yet it is really meant by the distinction, that regenerating grace is only bestowed on the elect, because regenerating grace is supposed to be indefectible, and to involve in all cases final perseverance. It is this doctrine which is really at the root of the controversy, so far, at least, as to explain the earnestness with which it is carried on; for modern Calvinists and Evangelicals generally hold that regenerating grace can never be lost.

The line of argument in support of Mr. Gorham's position consists very much in an attempt to prove that such doctrine as his has always been held without censure in the Church, and that it was involved in the tenets of those who drew up our Articles and other formularies.

The whole question in debate appears to resolve itself into one point—namely, whether the grace of God once given can ever be lost. This doctrine of the indefectibility of grace simply, is a different one from that of the indefectibility of grace in the elect. It may be held that grace given to the elect is irresistible and indefectible, and yet it need not necessarily be held that grace can *never* be given except to the elect. To prove that large numbers of persons in the Church have held the doctrines of the particular election, the irresistible and indefectible grace, and the

final perseverance of the saints, and personal assurance, is not to prove that they believed grace of all kinds restricted to the elect, or that they believed it impossible to fall finally from a state of grace. So that any amount of proof which may be brought to show that our divines at or after the Reformation held what are called Calvinistic doctrines, are absolutely worthless as regards the present discussion, unless they are shown distinctly to have taught, not merely *that grace in the elect is indefectible*, but that *grace is never received except by the elect*.

Bearing this in mind, let us approach Mr. Goode's proofs, and endeavour to ascertain their bearing on the question.

Mr. Goode examines, in his third chapter, "the school of theology to which our Reformers and early divines belonged" (p. 38.); and he then speaks in the following terms:—

"It may be useful, therefore, if, before I proceed further, I endeavour to throw some light upon the question, what was the prevailing bias of the theology of our reformers and early divines, especially respecting the Church, predestination, and some kindred topics. . . . I would premise, however, that while I adduce the following testimonies, as showing the *prevailing* bias of the theology of our Church at the time spoken of, I by no means wish to imply that the articles and formularies of our Church were formed upon a Procrustean principle of reducing the views of all to the *precise* standard of that prevailing bias. Our reformers were men of far too much Christian charity to adopt such a principle. But the object which I have in view is simply this, to prove, by shewing the general tone and character of the theology of our early divines of the reformed school, what modern school among us approaches the nearest to their standard, and consequently to *the intended meaning of the formularies they drew up*. My conviction is, that I might take *much higher ground* than this; but with this I am contented. And, though the discussion has only a general bearing upon the subject more immediately before us, yet its indirect evidence respecting it will be admitted, by all those who know how much any one's doctrine upon the point in question may be judged by the system of theology to which he is attached, to be of very great force. In fact, if it shall appear (and I believe it to be undeniable) that their doctrine was, in the most important points, what is now called 'Calvinistic,' there is, or ought to be, an *end* to the controversy as to the interpretation they intended to give to our formularies, both as it respects baptism and several other points."—pp. 38, 39.

A long extract then follows, taken from the "Institution of a Christian Man," published in 1537, and in the composition of which Archbishop Cranmer took a part. This extract, or rather series of extracts, shows that the compilers believed in the "appropriating character of true faith;" *i. e.* the believer was taught to profess his belief that the gospel, with its promises, applied

not merely to the world in general, but to himself in particular. It is also clear that the authors of this work held the doctrine of election and predestination to eternal life; that they believed the elect would never fall away finally; and that they considered them to constitute the real and living members of the Church, all others being regarded as only apparently and outwardly members of it. This is all very true, but we do not see that it advances Mr. Goode nearer to his point. With the exception of the doctrine of appropriating faith, there is nothing in the above which the Church of Rome itself does not say—nothing more than even Arminians have said; and, certainly, nothing more than the Seventeenth Article has said. There is no assertion that grace is given only to the elect. We are perfectly ready to accept, as consistent with the faith, the statements which Mr. Goode has quoted. They do not in any degree militate against the belief in baptismal grace, or furnish any evidence of a set of doctrines opposed to such belief. The tenet of appropriating faith was first put forward by the Lutherans. It is prominently stated in the confession of Augsburg, and the defence written by Melancthon, and confirmed several years before Calvin wrote his “Institutes:” and yet the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is taught by the very same work. We extract the following passages in illustration of this. First from the Confession of Augsburg:—

“*De Justificatione.*

“Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis, aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, *cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum*, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit.”

And the “Defence” remarks as follows:—

“*Hæc igitur fides specialis qua credit unusquisque sibi remitti peccata propter Christum, et Deum placatum et propitium esse propter Christum, consequitur remissionem peccatorum, et justificat nos.*” — *Apologia Confess. August. Art. ii.*

This special or appropriating faith was therefore the tenet of the Lutherans. And yet they also held that baptism is necessary to salvation, and condemned the anabaptists, who affirmed that infants might be saved without baptism.

“De Baptismo docent, quod sit necessarium ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur *gratia Dei*, et quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblatis Deo recipiantur in *gratiam Dei*, et fiant filii Dei. . . . Damnant anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum, et affirmant infantes sine baptismo et extra Ecclesiam Dei salvos fieri.” — *Art. ix.*

In the remarks on this in Melancthon’s “Defence,” it is declared

that "God gives the Holy Spirit" to infants who receive baptism; and in neither case is any exception made, but the grace is supposed to be given in all cases to baptized infants. It is, however, superfluous to enter into proofs of the Lutheran doctrines; for it is generally admitted, that they combined the tenet of appropriating faith with that of baptismal regeneration. Therefore no such expressions as Mr. Goode has quoted from the earlier Reformation-formularies of the English Church are of the slightest value, as a proof that they held the Calvinistic tenets as to the restriction of grace to the elect.

Again, Mr. Goode depends on passages in these writings, and in some of Cranmer's works, in which it is asserted that the elect will persevere to the end. He underlines passages in which Cranmer speaks of "*the elect*, in whom finally no fault shall be, but they shall perpetually continue and endure;"—that "*the elect shall not wilfully and obstinately withstand God's calling*," and other similar passages; and he remarks on these various passages that they show plainly that Cranmer's views, and those taught by public authority in the "Institution," comprehended the following points:—"(1.) That election is wholly and entirely of God's free and sovereign mercy, and that such as are elected continue Christ's disciples to the end. (2.) That true Christian faith is enjoyed by such only, and is indefectible. (3.) That true Christian faith is an appropriating faith. (4.) That those who ultimately perish, never were members of the true Catholic Church or mystical body of Christ." (pp. 48—52.) And we are invited to believe that all this is Calvinism, and therefore that it is incredible that the Reformers could have believed that regeneration was conferred on all infants in baptism. We suppose, on the same grounds, the Seventeenth Article is Calvinistic—purely Calvinistic. If the assertion of the doctrine of election and predestination—if the assertion of the final perseverance of the elect is Calvinistic, the Seventeenth Article is very explicit on these points; and it is wholly superfluous to go back to Cranmer and the preceding formularies of the Church of England. Mr. Goode might have saved himself a great deal of trouble by simply citing the Seventeenth Article. Let us quote it, and see what it states:—

"XVII. Of Predestination and Election.

"Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called *according to God's purpose* by his Spirit working in

due season : they through grace obey the calling : they be justified freely : they be made sons of God by adoption : they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ : they walk religiously in good works, *and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting life.*"

Now really this does seem to speak quite as plainly and distinctly of the election and final perseverance of the saints as well can be expressed. But is this Calvinism? If it be so, we can only say that the Church of Rome and the disciples of Arminius are Calvinists. There is nothing in the above except what has been admitted in common by Calvinists, Arminians, and Jesuits. We will just quote from Mosheim an account of the tenets of the disciples of Arminius. They held

"That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would *persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus ;*"

And

"That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free-will ; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable of thinking or doing any good thing ; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ."—*Cant.* xvii. sect. ii. part ii. c. 3.

Here, of course, we have a doctrine of election and final perseverance. And now let us turn in another direction :—

"Predestination is ordinarily taken in the good sense as the election and appointing of some to grace and to glory ; which predestination is entitled in the Scriptures, 'Calling according to the purpose of God, love, separation, election, preparation, fore-ordaining,' &c. . . . Predestination is defined by St. Augustine as . . . 'the fore-knowledge and preparation of God's benefits, by which those who are delivered are most surely delivered.' . . . 'A real predestination by God must be admitted. This belief of the Church is demonstrated by so many testimonies of Scripture, that it is marvellous that it can be doubted by Christians.' Matt. xxv. 34 ; Luke xii. 32 ; Rom. viii. 30 ; Ephes. i. 4, 5. 'That this is the faith of the Church, which cannot be denied without error, St. Augustine affirms several times, who wrote also expressly against the Semipelagians two books, one on the Predestination of the Saints, the other on the Gift of Perseverance.' . . . 'The orthodox all unite in professing that predestination to grace is altogether gratuitous, and this is the capital doctrine of faith, in the defence of which St. Augustine was engaged for twenty years against the Pelagians and Semipelagians.' 'Amongst supernatural benefits, there are three principal effects of predestination, namely, calling, justification, *and glorification.*' 'Predestination is certain and unalterable.' 'The

number of the predestinated is certain and determined.' 'The reprobation of some is so clearly expressed in Holy Scripture, that there is no need of any long proof to demonstrate it. The texts of Scripture quoted above, and especially that of Matthew xxv. 'Go ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels,' are amply sufficient. And the reason is evident, first, because God possesses the fore-knowledge that the wickedness of some will not come to an end, and has prepared a punishment which will never end, and this is reprobation; secondly, because it pertains to the Providence of a supreme being, an universal agent, who foresees all things, to permit for the manifestation of his glory certain intellectual creatures freely to depart from the end of their being."

We suppose there are many persons who might look on this as all very sound Calvinism; and, if Mr. Goode had quoted such language from Cranmer and the other reformers, he would have argued that persons who thus unequivocally taught the doctrines of personal election, final perseverance, and even the reprobation of individuals, could not possibly have held the doctrine of baptismal grace. He would have argued that the question was quite settled by such statements—that it would be quite impossible that such persons could ever hold that the grace of regeneration was given in baptism except to the elect. And yet, to show the fallacy of such reasoning, it is only necessary to state that the above passage consists of a series of extracts from one of the theological treatises of Dr. Tournely, one of the leading divines of the Church of Rome¹.

To return, then, to the point immediately before us, it is evidently most fallacious to assume, as Mr. Goode has done, that the Reformers and others who held, what are frequently called "Calvinistic" doctrines by those who are not well versed in the controversy, must necessarily have believed that grace is only given to the saints who are predestinated to eternal life; and, consequently, that regeneration is not in all cases bestowed on infants in baptism.

It is of little consequence to the argument then, whether Peter Martyr and others, in the reign of Edward VI., held the "prevailing system" on "the points of election, predestination, and final perseverance." (p. 55.) All this has nothing to do with the question. Romanists held these doctrines as well as the Reformers. Mr. Goode quotes from Peter Martyr the following passage:—

"From a misunderstanding of the *holy fathers* [what does Mr. Goode think of such an expression?] there has sometimes risen that error, that

¹ Vide "Prælectiones Theologicæ de Deo et Divinis Attributis quas in Scholis Sorbonicis habuit *Honoratus Tournely*, Sacræ Facultatis Parisiensis Doctor, Socius Sorbonicus," &c. — *Tom. ii. passim*.

our good works are in some manner the cause of our predestination ; namely, that God foreseeing that his people will embrace his offered grace, and make a good use of his gifts, does, for this cause, predestine and predetermine them to salvation.”—p. 58.

This doctrine has been denied by many even in the Church of Rome, so that it is really of no use to produce language of this kind. Mr. Goode quotes copiously similar passages from Bucer (p. 61, &c.) ; from Becon (p. 68, 69) ; and from Traheron (p. 70, 71). In a letter written by the latter in 1552, he states that many of the clergy agreed with Calvin in his view that God not only foresaw, but foreordained, the fall of Adam and the ruin of his posterity. We have already seen that those who held that God pre-ordained that punishment of the reprobate, have not denied the grace of the Sacraments, but most strongly upheld it. Therefore, this opinion, extreme as it is, has nothing to say to the question before us. It is perfectly useless to quote passages, as Mr. Goode does (p. 73), from the “Short Catechism” of Edward VI., comprising the doctrine of election. Of course the Seventeenth Article teaches that doctrine. The “*Reformatio Legum*” teaches the same doctrine (p. 74) ; but what has this to do with the question ? And again, the testimony of Bradford and his controversy with his fellow-prisoners, who held the doctrine of free will (p. 75, &c.), is really altogether beside the question. It only proves that Bradford held the doctrine of predestination, and that he considered his fellow-prisoners to hold Pelagian errors on the subject of free will. It shows that Bishop Ferrar, Rowland Taylor, and Philpot, subscribed their names to a document in which the doctrine of election, predestination, and final perseverance, was clearly taught. But it does not in any way teach that these confessors of the truth held that grace was never given except to the elect—that grace is in all cases indefectible. Mr. Goode endeavours to account for Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, not “setting their hands” to the document in question ; but we really think it is of little consequence to the matter in hand, whether they did or not. If they had done so, it would not advance Mr. Goode towards his conclusion.

But, in fact, at this point Mr. Goode makes an admission which appears to us at once completely subversive of his whole line of argument. In a note, at p. 81, he speaks thus :—

“ Dr. Laurence says, ‘ The doctrine which seems to have been a principal point of controversy between the Predestinarian and Anti-Predestinarian party, and to have proved most offensive to the latter, was that which is usually called *the indefectibility of grace*.’ (p. xl.) Now, if instead of the phrase ‘ the indefectibility of grace,’ which (though it has certainly often been used by divines) is ambiguous, and likely to mislead, inasmuch as it is very generally granted that every kind of grace

is not indefectible, we insert the phrase *the indefectibility of true Christian faith and justification*, Cranmer was clearly, from the passages given above, a supporter of the doctrine."

This is really a very striking passage as bearing on the case before us. Here is Mr. Goode expending great research and pains to produce authorities from the Reformation writers, to show that very many of them held the doctrines of election, predestination, final perseverance, &c. But what does he let out incidentally in this note? "IT IS VERY GENERALLY GRANTED THAT EVERY KIND OF GRACE IS NOT INDEFECTIBLE!" Granted by whom? By Mr. Goode and those who think with him—by the Reformers too—by those who hold such "Calvinistic" doctrines as the above. So, then, it appears that those who hold such doctrines, "generally grant" that "every kind of grace is not indefectible." They can, therefore, have no kind of difficulty in admitting that *grace is given in baptism*, though many fall from that grace afterwards. And, therefore, Cranmer, Becon, Bradford, Philpot, the authors of the "Institution," the "Reformatio Legum," the "Short Catechism," and the "Seventeenth Article" may, every one of them, have taken the expressions of the baptismal service simply and straightforwardly as declaring that the grace of God is given to all baptized infants, though some of them fall from grace afterwards. The moment it can be shown, as Mr. Goode has here done, that the *literal meaning* of the baptismal service is perfectly consistent with the general tenets of all who can have been supposed to have had any share in its composition, or any influence on it, the whole matter is settled. All those writers—nay, all their opponents in the Church of Rome, would have granted that "indefectible grace"—or such grace as is connected with final perseverance, is not given to all infants in baptism; but they might and did hold that the gift of grace was not always connected with final perseverance, and, therefore, that infants are regenerated by grace in baptism, though some of them afterwards "fall from grace," as the article distinctly teaches that some do.

We must now return to Mr. Goode's arguments. He next quotes (p. 83) a passage from Archdeacon Philpot, conveying the doctrine of election and predestination; and another passage, (p. 84), in which he states, in his examination before Queen Mary's Commissioners in 1555, that the Romanists were not able to answer Calvin's "Institutes," and he acknowledged the Church of Geneva to be orthodox, and held that the doctrine of the Church of England in King Edward's days was, as well as that of Geneva, "according" to "the doctrine that the apostles did preach." Mr. Goode remarks that this passage is "conclusive upon the question at issue." How it can be so we are at a loss to see,

when Mr. Goode himself says it “is generally admitted that all grace is not indefectible,” and when the identity of doctrine, of which Philpot speaks, plainly refers chiefly to the testimony borne by Geneva and England against Romanism. The concurrence which was expressed with Calvin’s views by such men as Philpot and others should not be interpreted as conveying any evidence of an absolute agreement with that eminent writer in all respects. Some of his tenets were extreme, and he himself, as is well known, relaxed his system so far as to adopt ultimately the sublapsarian doctrine. But Mr. Goode’s own pages furnish ample evidence that all who hold what he calls Calvinistic tenets do not adopt every part of the tenets of Calvin, or follow out the Calvinistic theory into all its details. He himself speaks (p. 70) of “an extreme statement of Calvin as to God’s predetermination of the evil actions of men,”—and quotes a passage from Traheron in which the supralapsarian doctrine is stated. And in p. 85 he observes, that “the general view of doctrine which prevailed among our old divines is encumbered in the writings of some of the Reformers, and of those that succeeded them at the latter part of the sixteenth century, with notions and phrases of *dangerous and unscriptural character*; as, for instance, that “Christ died only for the elect, that *the predestination of God, and not sin, is the cause of man’s condemnation*,” &c. This latter tenet is, decidedly, one of the tenets of Calvin; and yet “against these notions,” says Mr. Goode, “it is, of course, not difficult to find passages in the writings of our Reformers.” So that it is plain that approbation of Calvin, and agreement with him and with others, in holding the doctrines of predestination, election, and final perseverance, affords no proof of concurrence with him in all points of his system, or in all the adjuncts to or deductions from it.

In p. 86, Mr. Goode proceeds to inquire into the tone of theological doctrine current amongst the divines of the English Church at the accession, and during the reign of Elizabeth; and he begins by quoting from writers who speak of the Calvinistic tendencies of the divines of that period. Be it so. We cannot see that Mr. Goode is any nearer to his point. He lays hold of these statements of anti-Calvinistic writers, and he makes the following deduction:—

“If their views were what are called ‘Calvinistic’ (which is clearly admitted in the above passages), are we to suppose that the formularies they *voluntarily* established are opposed to their views? Is it credible, is it within the bounds of reason to suppose, that those who had the remodelling of our formularies on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, should establish such a doctrine as they themselves could not honestly subscribe, or even such as did not *favour* their views? The question

so completely answers itself, that it would be absurd to propose it, but for the fact, that men prepossessed by the prejudices of habit and education, and judging from the circumstance that almost the whole of the wealth and power of the National Church have long been in the hands of divines of contrary views, venture to assert that our formularies are opposed to, and inconsistent with the maintenance of such doctrines."—p. 87.

We fully admit the improbability that the Elizabethan divines should have established formularies contradictory to, or inconsistent with, their own faith. There can be no question of this. But we should infer from this, that they did not hold the doctrine of "the indefectibility of grace;" because that doctrine is plainly rejected in the Articles, and because Mr. Goode himself admits that, in a certain sense, it is generally denied. And proceeding another step we should infer further, that they *did* hold the doctrine of baptismal grace, of regeneration in baptism, as given to all baptized infants, because it is too plainly expressed in the formularies for any fair-minded man to avoid seeing it there. If they had doubted baptismal grace, they could not have established such formularies as they did: and their Calvinism, whatever it was, was plainly such as to be reconcileable with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Such is our inference from the alleged and undeniable fact that Calvinistic views prevailed largely amongst the Elizabethan divines. Those divines were more extreme in some instances than Mr. Goode himself. It was, doubtless, the tendency to over speculation on the awful and profound subjects involved in the controversies on predestination, that led to a reaction in the shape of Arminianism, which, we believe, led some astray from the plain doctrines of the Church of England—of the Western Church in former ages—and of Scripture itself on these points. But, we have no reason to believe, that the compilers or revisers of our formularies ever taught such tenets as are inconsistent with a belief in the gift of baptismal grace to all infants who are baptized.

In testimony of the Calvinistic character of the Elizabethan divines, Mr. Goode first quotes Nowell's catechism (pp. 88, 89); and undoubtedly that formulary teaches the doctrine of predestination. That is all which bears on the point before us. The next extracts are from the "Bishops' Bible" (p. 92). They teach the same doctrine as the Seventeenth Article does. After this we have an extract from a letter of Bishop Jewell to Peter Martyr, in which he declares that he entirely agreed with him in doctrine, and did not differ "by a nail's breadth." We know what such expressions mean when we remember Mr. Goode's own admission of differences between our Reformers and the ex-

treme statements of some Calvinists. Jewell, however, evidently was not thinking of the point of baptismal regeneration, or else did not consider the foreign Reformers to deny it, for he himself plainly teaches the doctrine. The writings of Bullinger are referred to, and Mr. Goode informs us (p. 94), that Jewell, in a letter to that divine, declares the agreement between the doctrine of the Church of England and the Helvetic Confession drawn up by Bullinger in 1566. This is, of course, to be understood with some reserve ; but the fact is, that the Helvetic Confession there referred to is a very judicious and moderate work on the Calvinistic controversy. There is a great deal in it which we should cordially rejoice to see admitted by many members of the Church of England.

On the point of baptismal regeneration, there is nothing therein inconsistent with the plain language of our baptismal formularies. It recognizes in sacraments not only an outward sign, but an inward grace given with the sign. It says that sacraments are "*symbola mystica, vel ritus sancti aut sacræ actiones, a Deo ipso institutæ, constantes verbo suo, signis, et rebus significatis . . . quibus promissiones suas obsignat, et quod ipse nobis internis præstat, externis repræsentat,*" &c. And "in Baptism," it says, "*signum est elementum aquæ, ablutioque illa visibilis, quæ fit per ministerium. Res autem significata est regeneratio vel ablutio a peccatis.*" It declares that the water of baptism is to be called regeneration, or the laver of renovation. It disapproves of the doctrine of those who speak of the sacraments as common signs, not sanctified and "efficacious signs" (*Confessio Helvetica*, cap. xix). "To be baptized in the name of Christ is," according to this expression, "to be inscribed, initiated, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the children of God, yea, to be called by the name of God, that is, to be called a son of God ; to be cleansed from the pollution of sin, and to be gifted with the various graces of God unto a new and innocent life." "All these things are sealed to us by baptism ; for we are inwardly *regenerated*, purified, and renewed of God by the Holy Spirit ; but outwardly we receive the sealing of these exceeding great gifts, in the water." "We condemn the anabaptists, who deny that the new-born infants of the faithful should be baptized. For, according to the doctrine of the gospel, of such is the kingdom of God, and they are included in the covenant of God. Why therefore should not the sign of the covenant of God be given to them ? Why should not they be initiated by holy baptism, who are the possession and in the Church of God ?" (*Confess. Helvetica*, cap. xx.) Most certainly there is nothing in this confession which militates against the plain and simple statements of the baptismal offices of our Church. It teaches that all the

infants of Christians are in covenant with God, and members of his Church, even before baptism. So that none of them are excluded from his grace, and hence it is argued that they ought to receive the outward sign of grace. The language used would seem to imply that they are born in a state of salvation, or else are placed fully in such a state in baptism. Calvin himself distinctly teaches the same doctrine. He defends the baptism of infants on the ground that they are within the covenant; and that, therefore, when a child has been baptized and dies shortly, the parents may feel assured that it is saved.

We must offer one or two remarks on this view of the subject. If it be held that the infants of all Christians are within the covenant, it must be also held that all Christians themselves are within the covenant. So that grace is not limited to the elect; and consequently grace is not always indefectible. Baptismal grace, therefore, may be received by many, who will afterwards lose it finally. If it be replied to this, that Bullinger and Calvin only meant that the children of the *elect* are in the covenant, and that they only ought to be baptized; the immediate answer is, that they taught that the children of *all* Christians ought to be baptized; and that they did not restrict baptism to the children of the elect. If, therefore, the Elizabethan divines were admirers of Bullinger and Calvin, we do not see what possible difficulty they could have in declaring every child regenerate who had received baptism. They must have held that there was some covenant distinct from election and predestination—some covenant, and some union with God, which did not imply final perseverance; some grace of the Holy Spirit which might be lost. The doctrine of Calvin and Bullinger is here rather inconsistent with itself, and with other tenets held by Calvin, at least; but we think it leads to a view of grace being given irrespective of election, which is just as inconsistent with modern Calvinistic teaching, as the doctrine of baptismal regeneration itself.

Mr. Goode takes much pains to prove the agreement of the doctrines of our Elizabethan divines with foreign reformed communions (p. 95, &c.); and that the Church did not differ from the Puritans in doctrine. We do not see how all this, in any degree, affects the question. Granted that many of our divines held a good deal of Calvinism, it still does not follow that they doubted baptismal grace. As to the quotations from Parker, Whitgift, Bancroft, Rogers, Abbott, Sandys, Hutton, Matthew, and sundry other bishops; and from Martyr, Holland, Robert Abbott, Prideaux, Calfehill, Bunfield, Whitaker, Cartwright, Playfere, Davenant, Hooker, and the condemnation of Barrett (pp. 98—119), we cannot see how they bear on the question. They all

teach such points as election, and final perseverance ; but not one of them denies that grace is given except to the elect. Consequently, all these persons may have held that baptismal grace is given to all infants who are baptized.

One passage from Playfere's Sermons we must dwell upon for a moment. It suggests a difficulty in the doctrine of predestination and election, and solves it thus :—

“It is nothing but a slander which the Church of Rome casteth upon us, that forsooth we should teach a man, whose person is justified by faith in Christ, committing some foul act, is never a whit the worse for it. Nay, our doctrine is this, that such an one hath hurt himself two ways. In respect to his own guiltiness, and in respect of God's righteousness. For the first, though God for his part do not break off the purpose of adoption and adjudge him to wrath, and therefore he is not guilty of condemnation for sin, yet he is simply guilty of sin, and hath grievously wounded his own conscience. For the second, though God again hath pardoned all the sins of his elect, even those that are to come, by his decree, by his promise, by the value and price of his Son's merits, yet absolutely and actually He doth not apply this pardon to the apprehension and feeling of the sinner's faith, till he recover himself, and renew his repentance.”—p. 109.

Thus, then, it is admitted, that the elect of God may fall into sin, and be guilty simply of sin, and thus hurt himself, and be in need of God's pardon. If, then, the elect and the justified are capable of falling into sin and of requiring God's pardon, there is no more difficulty in supposing that the reprobate, or those who will finally perish, may nevertheless receive the grace of God, and thus be made acceptable to Him, or be justified for a time. There is no more inconsistency in supposing the reprobate justified in baptism, than in supposing the elect subject to God's displeasure for sin.

We now come to the Lambeth Articles, which were drawn up in 1595, and which certainly teach several doctrines connected with predestination, in a very forcible manner. They forsake Calvin however in the doctrine of reprobation, and they only assert that “*saving grace* is not given to all men, by which they may be saved if they will” (p. 120) ; but they do not assert that “*grace*” is given only to the elect, and that it is always indefectible. Therefore, they are not inconsistent with the doctrine of the baptismal regeneration of infants. There is a most essential difference between asserting that “*grace*” is given only to the elect, and that “*saving grace*” is only given to the elect. The former would be the position of the modern Calvinists so called, and includes a denial of the baptismal regeneration of infants, except in certain cases. The latter, which was the position of the authors of the Lambeth Articles, is not opposed to the doctrine

of grace being given to all infants in baptism. Those authors doubtless held that all baptized infants receive grace in baptism, though saving grace, *i. e.* such grace as is connected with final perseverance in a state of grace, was only given to the predestinated. Archbishop Whitgift, it appears, declared that the doctrine of the Lambeth Articles was "agreeable to the Articles of Religion established by authority;" and that it had been "uniformly professed in the Church of England." And from these statements Mr. Goode argues thus:—

"The value and force of the testimony I leave the reader to appreciate. He may also, I suppose, easily determine the question, whether, in the face of these proceedings, within a few years of the establishment of our standard of doctrine, and of the affirmations here made of such doctrine having been *the uniform doctrine* of our Church, it can be maintained, not merely that these propositions go *beyond* the express statements of our Articles (which is a totally different question), but that the statements of the two are *opposed* to each other."—pp. 121, 122.

From what has been said, it is evident that the Lambeth Articles do not contradict the doctrine of the gift of God's grace in baptism to all infants. So that the above argument is fallacious.

We pass on to some extracts from Bishop Overall's writings, and certain remarks made on them. In the controversy which arose on the subject of Arminianism early in the seventeenth century, Overall compiled a paper containing his judgment on the points in controversy. In this paper he takes a middle course between the contending parties. We are not concerned with his views, except so far as they bear directly on the point before us. Overall, then, is a marked instance of what we have been pointing out; namely, that the acknowledgment of election, predestination, and final perseverance, is perfectly reconcilable with the belief that grace is given in baptism even to those infants who are not amongst the elect. He holds "the more common opinion of the Church since Augustine"—that God gives "common and sufficient grace in the means divinely ordained" to all; but "a special grace, more efficacious and abundant," to the elect only. Now we have seen that even Mr. Goode himself grants that it is "generally granted" by the Reformers "that every kind of grace is not indefectible;" *i. e.*, of course, that there are different kinds of grace. He also says, immediately after the passages we are considering, "That there is a species of faith from which men may fall away, all admit" (p. 133). Thus, then, Overall merely draws a distinction which he was authorized to do by general consent. That is to say, he distinguishes between grace given to all Christians, and grace given to the elect; though he unites with this the no-

tion of a more efficacious or powerful grace in the one case than in the other, which was a peculiar opinion. In the distinction generally, however, abstracted from this peculiarity, there is nothing but what all Calvinists in these ages admitted.

We must here extract a passage from Mr. Goode's pages :—

“The difference, then, between the view of Overall (following Augustine) and that of the great body of our Reformation divines, on the subject of final perseverance seem only this, that the latter held, that those once made members of Christ, and partakers of true faith and repentance, never fall away, while the former held that some to whom these blessings are vouchsafed do fall away, but that to certain individuals, elected by God to salvation, God of his free mercy vouchsafes to superadd a measure of grace that ensures perseverance.

“In what way Augustine's doctrine smooths the difficulties of the subject, I cannot understand. It appears to me that the doctrine—that spiritual regeneration and its accompanying graces and gifts are generally given, but that none but those upon whom the gift of final perseverance is bestowed will be saved, and that that gift is bestowed only upon the elect,—is equally difficult of reception with the doctrine that spiritual regeneration and its accompanying blessings are given only to the elect, and that those to whom they are given have also the gift of final perseverance. The exclusion of those who are not among the elect is as complete in the former system as in the latter ; and the only difference between the two systems is as to the amount of spiritual gifts bestowed upon those whom God has not appointed to salvation. This seems to me a question of no very material moment. . . . Augustine, no doubt, speaks of all baptized in infancy as spiritually regenerated.” —p. 135.

At the commencement of this passage Mr. Goode makes an assumption, which he has not attempted to establish by proof, that there was a difference between the views of Augustine and those of the Reformation divines on the subject of final perseverance ; and that this difference referred to the gift of regeneration, which the one supposed universally bestowed on Christians, and the other restricted to the elect. None of Mr. Goode's quotations and proofs so far have pointed at such a difference as is here alleged to exist. His pages are full of extracts from the writings of the Reformers and of subsequent writers who held what are called “Calvinistic” opinions ; and no authority so frequently is referred to in these passages as St. Augustine. It is indeed well known that the authority of St. Augustine was deeply revered by the Reformers generally. Nevertheless, it is singular that Mr. Goode should not have been able to produce any passages in which the Reformers express dissent from St. Augustine's views on this point. They, of course, all knew perfectly well that St.

Augustine combined a belief in baptismal regeneration with the doctrine of election, predestination, and final perseverance; yet Mr. Goode does not show that they differed from his doctrine. We are therefore entitled to assume that they *agreed* with him in this respect; and that they took the expressions of the baptismal offices in their natural sense. Mr. Goode himself distinctly proves that there could not have been any difficulty on their part in receiving the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as applicable in a certain sense to all; for he remarks, that the only difference between the two systems [that of Calvinism and the doctrine of St. Augustine] “is as to the *amount* of spiritual gifts bestowed upon those whom God has not appointed to salvation;” and he thinks this is “a question of no very material moment.” So that the adherents of Calvinism could not have had any reluctance to admit that grace is given to all infants in baptism.

This appears to us perfectly conclusive of the question. It is in vain for Mr. Goode, after this, to contend that, because the Reformers or Elizabethan divines held Calvinistic tenets, they could not have received the baptismal formularies in their simple direct meaning, but must have understood them to mean what they plainly do *not* mean—namely, that grace and regeneration is only given to the elect, and not to all children lawfully baptized. These subterfuges were unknown to the Reformers and the Elizabethan divines. If they had held the views of Mr. Goode, and of modern dissenters, they could not possibly have compiled offices which so distinctly retain the teaching of St. Augustine on regeneration. What dissenter or Calvinist in the present day would compose offices like our baptismal offices?

We must quote another passage for the purpose of noticing an assumption like that which we have just shown to be unfounded:—

“Those who confound the Predestinarian system that prevailed amongst the reformed with that of St. Augustine, suppose that that system had no bearing upon the views of the Reformers as to the effects of baptism; whereas, in truth, it had a very material influence upon them. Our Reformers, as a body, held that the elect only are made partakers of those spiritual gifts that are essential to regeneration, and that final perseverance was always connected with these gifts. I am not, of course, denying that some among the Reformers themselves may have held precisely St. Augustine’s view; but the evidence already adduced shows that the prevalent opinion was in favour of what is *now* commonly called the *Calvinistic* view.”—p. 136.

From the preceding survey of Mr. Goode’s evidence, as to the tone of theology prevalent at the period of the Reformation, and

subsequently, it is clear that he has not so far adduced the slightest ground for his assertion, that the Reformers held that "the elect only are made partakers of the spiritual gifts essential to regeneration." We repeat that the assertion is made without proof. For we have shown that the assertion of the doctrines of appropriating faith, final perseverance, election, and indefectible faith, which he has shown to have been frequent, does not include necessarily any denial of baptismal grace.

We have some further proofs of the Calvinistic character of English theology during the reign of Elizabeth (pp. 136—142). Admitting that Calvinism (in reference to the Predestinarian controversy) had then great influence in the Church, we must decline to admit the ultra and overstrained statements of the "British Critic," as possessing the slightest value or weight on such a subject. The object of the "British Critic," in the article quoted by Mr. Goode, was to show the propriety of a development of the Church of England in a Romish direction; and it therefore dwelt as strongly as possible on the alteration which took place in consequence of the Arminian principles superseding the Calvinistic in the seventeenth century; but we think that no true Churchman will recognize in the statements of the "British Critic," in its Romanizing days, any authority in questions affecting the doctrines of the Church of England.

We next come to Mr. Goode's argument, founded on the doctrine of the confessions of faith of the foreign Reformers. The connexion which existed between the English and the foreign Reformers is referred to, with a view to identify the opinions of the former with the latter. Without doubt this argument is to a certain extent a good one. That is, we may infer that there was a general agreement when it was acknowledged on both sides; but we have no right to strain such expressions so far as to suppose them to infer an agreement in *all* points of doctrine, more especially on the *amount* of grace given in baptism, which Mr. Goode himself holds to be a matter of no great moment, as we have seen.

In proceeding with our task, we must offer one or two explanatory remarks. In maintaining that an inward and spiritual grace is given in the sacraments, it is rightly conceded, and indeed affirmed, that *faith* is necessary to the reception of that grace. In saying this, however, it is not of course meant to deny that infants who cannot exhibit faith themselves, are capable of receiving baptismal grace. So that, while in general we affirm that faith is necessary to receive the grace of the sacraments, we make an exception in the case of infants. Looking at the statements of Holy Scripture on the subject of holy baptism, it is perfectly correct to say that repentance and faith are the condi-

tions of baptism; that regeneration, which is united to justification, or is justification in a certain aspect, is given only to believers in Jesus Christ. Nay, it is not unsound in doctrine, though it may be incorrect in expression, to use regeneration as equivalent to justification, and to speak of a person as regenerated when he is justified, and therefore to use that term of regeneration at times for something distinct from baptismal grace. Such language as this is quite consistent with a belief that all baptized infants receive baptismal grace, and are in *some sense* justified. Those who so speak may sometimes omit to specify the exception to the general rule of faith, as a prerequisite to the effectual reception of the sacraments; but we are not therefore to conclude that they do not recognize any such exception.

But we may also say, that in a certain sense the benefits of baptism are only given to the elect. The justification which is imparted to believers in that sacrament is, in the highest and most emphatic sense, only given to those who will persevere to the end. The justification of those who will fall finally from grace is of course temporary; nor can they be equally the subjects of God's favour with the elect. So that it is true, in a certain sense, that the elect are the subjects of baptismal grace: they alone are so in the highest sense of all—they alone are perfectly so. Others are imperfectly and transiently justified, regenerated, and adopted. They are rejected as regards their life generally; they are accepted in particular actions or points of that life: whereas the elect, on the other hand, are accepted on the whole, and displeasing in the particular sinful actions which they commit. The justification of the elect is certainly a different thing from that of the non-elect. It cannot be affirmed that the latter are *ever* regarded by God in all respects with the same favour as the former are. And therefore the adoption and acceptance in baptism of those who are not elect is in reality different from that of the elect. Grace is not given with the same effects to all alike.

These remarks will suffice to set aside the greater part of Mr. Goode's proofs. It is perfectly beside the question to produce extracts in which it is taught that the benefits of baptism are restricted to believers—that faith is an essential prerequisite—or that the elect only are regenerated in baptism. Such quotations may be well calculated to impose on the unwary reader, but they have really nothing to say to the question. It does not follow that these writers denied regeneration or its equivalent to be given to all infants in baptism.

Mr. Goode quotes several passages from the Helvetic Confession drawn up by Bullinger, on which we have already offered

some remarks, and, amongst the rest, one in which it is said that

“ To be baptized in the name of Christ is to be invited, initiated, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God : moreover, to be now called by the name of God, that is, to be entitled a son of God, to be cleansed likewise from the pollution of our sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, that we may lead a new and innocent life,” &c.—p. 145.

In order to explain this strong and clear language, Mr. Goode quotes some other parts of the same confessor, in which the benefits of baptism are connected with the salvation of the “ elect,” and “ regeneration” is spoken of as the result of “ faith ” (pp. 146, 147). It will appear, from our preceding remarks, that such passages as this do not in the least degree diminish the force of so striking a testimony to baptismal regeneration, as that of the Helvetic Confession.

Mr. Goode quotes such expressions, not only from the Helvetic, but from the Belgic Confession, and from the Catechism of Heidelberg, with the object of shewing that the bishop of Exeter was mistaken in quoting the strong language of these formularies on baptismal grace, in favour of the view, that all infants are regenerated in baptism. But it is most fallacious to argue as Mr. Goode has done, applying to the case of infant baptism expressions which were not written with any view to that exceptional case, and which refer solely to baptism where faith and repentance are the necessary preliminaries. It is also very fallacious to quote passages in which regeneration is used for justification, and affirmed to apply to the elect only, as if this implied any assertion that baptismal grace in every sense and degree is given to the elect only. It is in vain that such quotations are made to invalidate such passages as the following, which Mr. Goode himself produces from the Heidelberg Catechism.

“ Q. 69. In what way are you admonished and confirmed in baptism, that you are a partaker of that new sacrifice of Christ ?

“ A. Because Christ has commanded the external laver of water, with this promise annexed, that I am not less certainly washed by his blood and spirit from the pollutions of the soul, that is, from all my sins, than I am cleansed externally by water, by which the pollutions of the body are said to be washed away.

“ Q. Where has Christ promised that He will as certainly cleanse us by his blood and spirit, as we are cleansed by the water of baptism ?

“ A. In the institution of baptism, in these words : ‘ Go and teach all nations,’ &c. (Matt. xxviii. 19.) ‘ He that believeth, and is baptized,’ &c. (Mark xvi. 16.) This promise is repeated when Scripture

the baptism the laver of regeneration (Titus iii. 5), and the washing away of sins (Acts xxii. 16).”—p. 148.

Mr. Goode's answer to this explicit testimony is, that the author was a well known *Calvinist* (p. 149), the inference being, we suppose, that he must have meant that baptismal grace was only given to the elect. We have already seen the fallacy of any such inference; nor does Mr. Goode mend the matter by quoting passages from other works of the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, which he maintains that faith, justification, and regeneration are the effect of "election;" that the reprobate are never members of the *invisible* Church—the company of saints—that the regenerate can never finally fall away (p. 150). He is here using the term regeneration in connexion with final perseverance in the case of the elect. He does not seem to employ the term "regeneration" to designate the grace given in baptism, but "remission of sins," "renewal," and "cleansing," which describe what we mean by regeneration. So that there is no sort of reason to assume that he supposes the baptismal graces to be restricted absolutely to the elect, and that others have no part in them in any sense or degree.

"Regeneration" is, in fact, frequently used in the reformed confessions, such as the French, the Bohemian, &c., as equivalent to justification, and as obtained by faith. Baptismal grace is not infrequently described under different names, or terms, as in the case above referred to. In the Bohemian confession "sanctification, renewal, or regeneration," is spoken of as the same thing.

We must pass over several very striking testimonies to the doctrine of baptismal grace which Mr. Goode quotes from Calvin, Beza, and others, with a view to explain them away, as he has endeavoured to explain away our offices. What has been already said is a sufficient answer to his arguments, that because men held Calvinistic doctrines in many points, they could not possibly hold that grace was given to all infants in baptism.

We must next follow Mr. Goode into his examination of the doctrines of Bucer and Peter Martyr on the subject of infant baptism. Mr. Goode attaches very great weight to their testimony, as showing the views of Cranmer and other of the English Reformers who thought highly of them. The first quotation which is produced from the records of a conference between Luther and the Reformed school at Wittenburg, in 1536, commences with a declaration of Luther's, that infants ought to be baptized, "and that baptism is truly efficacious and confers the adoption of the sons of God"—in other words—*regeneration*. The reply of Bucer on behalf of the reformed is, that although they do not hold (with

Luther and his disciples) that infants have *faith*, yet *they believe in baptismal grace*.

“Moreover that baptism is held sacred by us, and that we teach concerning it, *not as of some naked sign*, but as *the true cause of regeneration*, which (regeneration) is, through the power of God and the ministry of the minister, *supplied to us with the water*. . . . For that *we simply believe and teach*, that TRUE REGENERATION AND TRUE ADOPTION INTO THE SONS OF GOD *are communicated to infants in baptism*, and that the Holy Spirit works in them according to the measure and proportion given to them, as we read of St. John, that he was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother’s womb. . . . But that where there is any foundation in Scripture for what some affirm, that infants when they are baptized *understand the words of the gospel, and actually believe them*, and thus are saved,—whence this can be proved from the sacred writings, we are unable as yet to see.”—p. 163.

With this declaration Luther was satisfied. (p. 164.) And indeed he well might be so, for although his own notion, with regard to infants being possessed of faith, was not adopted, still the great point was admitted—that infants ought to be baptized, and that they receive regeneration and adoption in baptism. Nothing can be more clear and explicit than the statement of the Reformers on this point. Luther himself subsequently stated (p. 164) that infants ought to be baptized because “they belong to the Church.”

Mr. Goode observes on the passage, that both Luther and Bucer “held that infants ought to be baptized *because* they were faithful, that is, in the sense of having the principle of faith implanted in them by the mercy of God. . . . The possession of this gift of faith, however, by infants was, of course (as Luther speaks in his Catechism, and as we shall find Bucer stating), a matter of charitable hope.” (pp. 164, 165.) We must demur to this statement. Bucer and the Reformed did not receive the notion of any real faith existing in infants. They *did not rest* the lawfulness of baptism on the assumption of such faith existing; and Luther himself did not require them to receive the view, from whence it is evident that he did not think it necessary. There is nothing in the passage about any “charitable hope.” All infants are declared to be regenerated in baptism. In fact this testimony of the Lutherans and Reformed is a very strong confirmation of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. We should be happy to see Mr. Goode and Mr. Gorham, and their disciples, employing such language as the Lutherans and Reformers did on this occasion. What would Bucer and Luther have thought of those who declaim against the “soul-destroying” error of baptismal regeneration, and teach that baptism is a mere sign or seal, and that regenera-

tion is to be looked for at another time, and not in baptism! We can have no doubt that such persons would have been regarded as "heretics" by Luther and the Reformed: they would have been classed with the anabaptists.

But Mr. Goode endeavours to explain away this very strong testimony to baptismal regeneration, by quoting a long passage from Bucer's writings, in which he contends that the sacraments are only beneficial; that their graces can *only reach* them who partake of them worthily and with faith. He argues against Luther and his adherents, who maintained that the body and blood of Christ is received by *all* who partake of the elements of bread and wine, no matter whether they have faith or no. He contends that doctrine of this kind is calculated to have bad moral effects. He asserts that faith is a necessary condition to the reception of sacramental grace, whether in baptism or in the Eucharist. And surely he is right in so saying. He teaches here nothing except what the Articles of the Church of England, at least, declare; but then he is not speaking of *infant* baptism, because he and his colleagues expressly stated in the passage quoted above, that infants do not possess faith—at least, such faith as is necessary in all cases where it is possible. All, therefore, that he says about faith being a necessary requisite to the right reception of baptism we admit, while we affirm with him that infants have not faith, and yet are regenerated and adopted in baptism.

Mr. Goode goes on to produce several passages from Bucer's writings, in which baptismal grace and regeneration are most strongly affirmed (pp. 168, 169). We accept these testimonies with pleasure, and are thankful to Mr. Goode for producing them. They are exactly the same kind of expressions as the Church of England uses. Well may Mr. Goode say that "Bucer had no hesitation in using the strongest language as to the benefit of baptism, when enunciating in general terms its nature and effects" (p. 170). But we draw a very different inference from that which Mr. Goode implies in saying that these passages show us with what views the Reformers used language, on several points, which "from its ambiguity and capability of diverse interpretations, has been since their time the cause of so much contention in the Church." Mr. Goode means that their language asserting *baptismal regeneration* is ambiguous, and that it must be interpreted by their statements as to the necessity of faith as a prerequisite for receiving the benefit of regeneration. We hold, on the contrary, that such language as he has quoted gives *unambiguous and clear* evidence of belief in baptismal regeneration, while the assertion of the necessity of *faith* is really ambiguous

and liable to mistake, for it is not *meant* to extend to the case of infants, though the exception is not expressly made. It is plain, from the passage he has himself quoted from the "conferences," that whenever the "Reformed" speak of the necessity of *faith* in order to obtain baptismal regeneration, they must be understood to except the case of infants, who are regenerated without the actual possession of faith. And indeed it is grossly inconsistent in any one to maintain, *absolutely and without exception*, that faith is a prerequisite for receiving regeneration in baptism, and yet to admit, as Mr. Goode and Mr. Gorham and their friends do, that regeneration is ever actually given in baptism to infants; for infants have no faith. If faith in the case of infants be requisite to regeneration, they are never regenerated; and thus the formularies of the Church of England and of all the Reformation, and the admissions of Mr. Gorham himself, are flatly contradicted. To interpret the assertions of the Reformers as to the necessity of faith, as applying to infant baptism, is to make a clean sweep not only of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but of the practice of infant baptism, and of the practice and doctrine of the Church of England—so that it is *absolutely essential* for Mr. Goode himself to understand all such language as he has quoted on this point, as *not extending to infant baptism*.

Mr. Goode follows up this extract from Bucer, by another, which comprises a strong and explicit statement of the doctrine of election and predestination. In this passage Bucer asserts that "those who can at any time fall away from Christ never were Christ's;" that "the reprobate never were known to Christ;" that "those to whom it has once been given, like Him, can never perish;" that though "infants are destitute of faith," yet "with elect infants the Spirit of the Lord is present," &c. (p. 170-171). All this passage refers to the gift of such grace as God foresees will be efficacious for its end—such grace as is combined with final perseverance and liberation from sin. It does not refer to grace in general, or imply any denial that grace, which shall not in all cases be joined with final perseverance, is given to infants in baptism. There is no reference to baptism or the sacraments generally in this passage: it refers simply to election and final perseverance; and it must be understood with the distinctions which the doctrine of the sacrament requires, and which even Mr. Goode and Mr. Gorham do not deny, for Mr. Goode himself does not assert that all grace is *indefectible*; nor does he consider the question, as to the amount of grace given in baptism, to be a very important one. We do not see any thing in the doctrine of Bucer, as stated by Mr. Goode, which is inconsistent with the clear and explicit declaration of himself and the

other Reformers, that regeneration is given to infants in baptism.

The next quotations are from Peter Martyr; and the object is to show that, while he held the divinity chair at Oxford, and approved the English formularies, he understood and taught that the benefit of baptism is restricted to the predestinate, though the sacrament is administered to all. In this passage Martyr is arguing against the anabaptists, who contended that baptism ought not to be administered to infants, "because we know nothing concerning the spirit, or faith, or election of these little ones." Martyr asserts that some infants are elect, and others not so; and he restricts the spiritual benefit of the sacraments to the elect; but teaches that baptism should be administered to all infants, because we cannot distinguish who *are* elect. This passage, like many others adduced by Mr. Goode, refers to the grace of baptism as united with final perseverance; as the gift of grace in the high and peculiar sense in which it belongs to the elect only. Martyr does not deny that grace is given in a certain sense to many who are not elect: at least there is nothing in the passages quoted by Mr. Goode to lead us to suppose that he would have denied that all infants receive regenerating grace, in some degree, in baptism. There is nothing in these passages to lead to the inference that the baptismal grace which Martyr so strongly *asserted* in a passage, also produced by Mr. Goode (p. 175), was not given generally to infants, though only effectual, finally, in the case of the elect. We see nothing in the language of Martyr inconsistent with a belief that all infants are regenerated, and made children of God in baptism; though, in some cases, that state of grace is only temporary and transient; in others, permanent.

The doctrine of election necessitates a distinction between the relation of those who are elect, and those who are not so, to God, at all times. The elect may fall into sin, and become subject to God's wrath, and yet it is the wrath of a Father who thinketh upon mercy. The reprobate may have a temporary faith, and may be temporarily and partially justified, but their acceptance with God is never the *same kind* of acceptance which is extended to those who are the chosen children of God. But still this should not prevent any one from believing that the grace of God in general may be extended to all children in baptism.

The examination of Mr. Goode's argument would demand far more space than we can afford for its discussion. We trust, however, that what has been already said will, in some degree, suffice to point out the fallacies in which it abounds. We think that he has been led to overlook, in the urgency of his advocacy;

the real meaning and bearing of much that he has collected to establish his point. We can very readily understand that his reasoning and authorities may, to very many persons, appear perfectly conclusive. His work is one which, from the absence of necessary distinctions, the very intricate, delicate, and profound questions on which it treats, is calculated to mislead men of the most educated intelligence. The discussion of topics on which the wisest and the best of men have often been at variance, and on which human language is most imperfect and liable to mistake, is difficult under all circumstances, but more especially in the heat of controversy; and we would extend to others the same fair construction which we are desirous to claim for ourselves. It is deeply to be regretted that controversies on such subjects should continue to disturb the Church. We know that there are great differences of opinion amongst those who admit the teaching of the Church of England, yet they are scarcely greater than those which exist in the Church of Rome on the same sort of questions. It is, therefore, a matter for deep regret that some way cannot be found for arriving at some arrangement which shall define the limits within which freedom of opinion is permissible, and which shall repress the violence of controversy.

Though we fear we are trespassing at too great length on the reader's attention, the importance of the subject-matter will plead our excuse for proceeding with our examination of Mr. Goode's series of arguments.

The next authorities which he quotes in favour of his views are the formularies issued by authority in the reign of King Henry VIII. The very decided language of these formularies, in connecting regenerating grace with baptism, is admitted by Mr. Goode to have been common both to these and to the "majority of the most distinguished continental Reformers" (p. 190.) Baptism is, according to them all, "a rite divinely appointed as the instrument, in the use of which a certain spiritual blessing is conveyed by God to the recipient." (Ibid.) The mode in which he explains such language is this—

"It is palpably a misinterpretation of this language to infer from it, that this sacrament is represented thereby as having this effect upon *all* who partake of it; because such general statements refer to the case of *adults* as well as *infants*; and in the former case, it is admitted even in these documents, that faith and repentance are necessary to a salutary reception of this sacrament. Therefore some similar qualifications may have been held necessary in the latter case. . . . To interpret these words as meaning that *all* infants are *alike* the objects of the divine mercy, is a gratuitous and unwarranted assumption, and, I may add, a

misrepresentation founded upon a forgetfulness of the doctrinal views of many of the authors of such statements."—pp. 190, 191.

If it be argued or maintained, as it is in this passage, that repentance and faith on the part of infants are requisite to the effectual reception of baptism, we really do not see how it is possible to avoid the anabaptist inference, that baptism is useless to infants; for, whatever may have been thought by some persons about infants themselves possessing faith, there is no proof for such a view in Holy Scripture, and certainly none from reason and experience. The natural and obvious inference from the statements connecting regeneration with baptism in the case of infants as well as adults, is that the writers referred to in general did not think it necessary expressly to except the case of infants when they spoke of repentance and faith as requisite for the effective reception of the grace of baptism, because they must have supposed that every one could make that exception, which was dictated by obvious necessity and common sense. We pass over various passages from Lancelot Ridley, who followed Luther's doctrine as to the existence of faith in infants, and from the formularies in the reign of Henry VIII., which assert the necessity of faith for the effectual reception of the sacraments (much as our own Articles do), and state the doctrine of election, and the efficacy of the sacraments only to the elect (p. 191—207). All this is merely the repetition of positions which have been already examined, and will be readily understood as indicating no doubt of the gift of regenerating grace to all baptized infants, in some sense. It may not, and does not imply, that "*all* infants are *alike* the objects of the divine mercy" (p. 191); but it is not inconsistent with the doctrine that all *are* objects of the divine mercy, which is openly stated.

We next proceed to the testimonies quoted from our leading Reformers and divines during the reigns of Edward VI. and his successors. The first quotations (from the Catechism of 1553) only speak of faith being a requisite condition of adult baptism (p. 210). In Cranmer's Catechism a distinction is made in the subjects of baptism, *some* only being supposed to be "born again" (p. 213). This will, of course, be admitted in the case of adults, some of whom may be baptized without faith and repentance. We also find the Church identified with those who "believe in the gospel, and are saved"—a position which has nothing to do with the matter before us. Mr. Goode admits that in Cranmer's works it is easy to find statements connecting *regeneration* with *baptism* (p. 215); but he quotes various passages in which the necessity of faith is asserted, obviously referring to the case of adult bap-

tism, or else assuming, as Luther did, that all infants *have* faith (pp. 216, 217).

The arguments which Mr. Goode employs (pp. 217, 218) with a view to establish the necessity of certain conditions to the reception of baptismal grace in the case of infants, are deserving of attention. He urges that we have no right to affirm that general statements of regeneration taking place in baptism are to be understood conditionally in the case of adults, but “be understood as applying universally in the case of infants.” The latter assertion he attempts to raise a prejudice against as a reproduction of the Romish doctrine of *opus operatum*—“that the sacraments confer grace on all who do not oppose the obstacle of mental sin”—“without any good and deserving motive,”—which has obviously no application to the case of infants, who, as Mr. Goode himself admits, are within the covenant of grace, and cannot need the conditions of repentance and faith, as Calvin himself argues in reply to the anabaptists. If Mr. Goode means to assert that the same conditions as in the case of adults are requisite in infant baptism, he is condemned by Calvin, and he holds the anabaptist tenets. If these conditions are not requisite, his argument is worth nothing.

Mr. Goode says :—

“I have thought it right to make these remarks at the very outset of our review of the statements of our early divines on the subject of this work, in order that the reader may bear in mind throughout, that the assertion—that the sacraments confer grace upon all not putting a bar in the way, and consequently that the general statements of our divines as to the effects of baptism, though to be understood with limitations in the case of adults, are to be considered as applicable in their full force to *all* infants—is wholly unwarranted, and directly opposed to the doctrine of our most learned divines of the school of Reformers.”—p. 220.

We must deny that the doctrine of *opus operatum* applies to the case of infant baptism. The expressions of “not putting a bar in the way,” and having no “good and deserving motive,” &c., refer to the case of persons who are capable of interposing obstacles, such as committing actual sin, and possessing a dead faith: they do not properly refer to infants who are simply in a state of unconsciousness in reference to spiritual things. So that *opus operatum* seems a doctrine which refers evidently to adults; and Mr. Goode must greatly mistake his adversaries’ argument in making them infer the partial operation of the doctrine of *opus operatum* in the case of adults, but its total and unconditional application in the case of infants. The truth is, that the tenet of *opus operatum* is not held by such persons as applicable to adults, and

if it be ever applied to the case of infants, which we are not aware that it is, the application seems mistaken; though the doctrine of the regeneration of all baptized infants is certain.

Nor can we admit, as a fair representation of the view opposed to Mr. Goode's, that the general statements of our divines are necessarily to be understood as applicable in their full force to all infants; for this statement, thus nakedly made, might imply that we meant to assert that God looks exactly in the same point of view on the elect and the non-elect; or that we mean to deny the doctrines of election and predestination, while asserting the doctrine of baptismal grace. Whether all infants receive regenerating grace in the same degree, or with the same effects and results, we need not pretend to determine; but that God does actually regenerate all infants in baptism, and make them his children by adoption, in a certain sense, is plainly and manifestly the doctrine of the Church of England and of the whole Catholic Church; and no other teaching ought to be permitted.

It does not follow that, because general statements as to the effects of baptism are to be understood conditionally in the case of adults, they must therefore be so understood in the case of infants (p. 220). Nothing could be more unreasonable than such an inference; in fact, it goes to the length of declaring that regeneration is *never* given to infants, because they are incapable of supplying the conditions which are prescribed by the Word of God in the case of adults. It may here be remarked, that any of the Reformers who suppose faith to be a necessary condition even in infant baptism, supposed faith to be given to all infants baptized. Mr. Goode argues, that "when we find the Church specifically demanding a promise of future faith and repentance to be exercised by the child when grown up, and giving baptism to none likely to reach that age without that promise being made, we reasonably infer, that she, *at least*, limits the baptismal blessing to those who, as adults, fulfil that promise" (p. 220).

We have no right to make such an inference as this, because the Church believes that the promise *actually* made by others is sufficient to authorize her to administer baptism, consisting of an outward sign and an inward grace. It is the promise itself, and not the future *performance* of that promise, which the Church accepts as a condition. The case of baptism in case of sickness shows that the Church does not consider such promise as *necessary* in the case of infants. In fact, if it were not made at all, the obligation to renounce sin, and to live in faith and holiness, which is the substance of the baptismal promise, is strictly binding on all persons baptized. Baptism is the admission to the privileges of the Christian covenant; it is the rite appointed by Christ

Himself for the initiation of new members into his family ; and the conditions of existence in that state are abstinence from sin, and a walk of faith and of sanctification. This obligation is incumbent on all who hope for salvation ; it is involved as a matter of necessity in the acceptance of baptism, without any express promise to that effect. If renunciations and professions are made either by adults previous to baptism, or by sponsors for infants, it is as a safeguard against the evil of an unconditional admission to baptism, or for the purpose of reminding Christians of the duties which they have undertaken, or are to undertake, as Christians.

The Church of England distinctly teaches, that infants baptized privately, *without any promises*, are “ fully and sufficiently baptized ;” and of such she declares that they are now, “ by the laver of regeneration in baptism, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.” Therefore it is most fallacious to argue that she considers the grace of baptism to be given only in contemplation of the future fulfilment of the promises made at baptism by sponsors.

We must offer some remarks on a passage which immediately succeeds that on which we have been commenting. It is as follows :—

“ No doubt infants are so far interested in their parents’ faith, that they may be reckoned by us, as infants, as being acceptable in the eye of God (the Apostle calling them holy) ; and, if they die in infancy, are partakers, as such, of the full baptismal blessing. Nor need we, I think, be anxious to deny that, in the case of infants, there *may* always be bestowed the pardon of original sin. And when the term regeneration is applied in this sense, by those who speak of the universal regeneration of infants in baptism, and the distinction is preserved between this infantine regeneration, and that regeneration of heart which is necessary for the salvation of an adult, then (whether or not we agree in the view taken) it seems very unnecessary to raise a further controversy. But that spiritual regeneration of the heart, of which Scripture speaks, and which sanctifies the adult, is a gift, not conferred by God in consequence of the parents’ faith, but according to his own good pleasure.”—p. 221.

If this really be the view taken by those who think with Mr. Goode generally, we should not be without hope of some kind of arrangement of the controversies at present existing on this most important subject. The difference, as thus stated by Mr. Goode, is, in some degree, a verbal difference. We allude to the use of the term regeneration, as applied by him to designate the change of heart by which adults enter into a state of justification, from which they have fallen through the temptations of the

world, the flesh, and the devil. There is no authority in our formularies to speak of this change of heart, as regeneration; but at the same time we would not say that false *doctrine* is connected with the use of the term for this process. Though there is no authority in Scripture for such a use of the term, there are not wanting instances of its use in this sense in the early writers, and in some of our modern divines. Therefore, while we think such a use of the term is not to be recommended, we would not condemn those who thus employ it.

And again—the regeneration of infants and their reception of baptismal graces does not imply the *same* change of heart which, in the case of an adult, is the preparation for baptism, and which is completed by baptismal grace. As infants have no actual sins to repent of, their regeneration is not exactly a regeneration in the same sense as that of adults; and in asserting that they obtain remission of their sins, and a new birth in baptism, through the sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God, it cannot be meant to deny that the necessity of subsequent change of heart and conversion to God is, in most cases, absolutely requisite. Mr. Goode does not deny, that grace and the gift of regeneration to infants is extended to them all in baptism; and, if so, we really think, that those who think with him ought to have no difficulty in accepting the baptismal services in their plain and simple meaning, which supposes regeneration and grace to be given to infants in all cases: and, if this were fairly and consistently done, we think there would be very little objection to the mere use of the term as an equivalent for conversion in the case of adults. The great evil of which all members of the Church of England have to complain is, that the “doctrine of baptismal regeneration,” which is distinctly taught in all our formularies, and which has always, even from the beginning, been taught in the Church, and which the whole body of the Reformers held, should be denied, and rejected, and denounced. While the formularies of the Church of England remain what they are, a denial of the doctrine that infants are regenerated in baptism is a positive censure of the Church of England. It is to accuse her of teaching erroneous doctrine—nay, as it is sometimes called—“soul-destroying error.”

Mr. Goode, and those who think with him, do not object to the doctrine that *all* infants *are* regenerated in baptism. Why, then, should they undertake to prove that the Reformers did not hold this view, or that they held regeneration to be confined strictly to the elect? We really think, that such admissions as this are fatal to the whole argument of Mr. Goode’s book. They show that the force of evidence is so strong, that he is *obliged* to admit, in the first place, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration in some

sense, in order to bring his teaching in any degree into accordance with that of the author he quotes; and then he proceeds to overthrow this doctrine by quotations which plainly have reference only to the case of adult baptism, or which refer to the doctrine of election and its concomitants without connexion with baptism.

To follow Mr. Goode further through the mass of quotations which he has accumulated for this purpose would be impossible within our necessary limits. We have merely indicated the key to the explanation of these quotations. We have scarcely seen any which appear in any degree to support the theory proposed by him in the case of *infants*. The fact is, that, notwithstanding all Mr. Goode's efforts to produce authorities in support of his view, his work affords throughout the most clear and unequivocal testimony to the doctrine of the Church generally, and of the Reformation in particular, in favour of baptismal regeneration. We are met continually by quotations of the strongest kind asserting that regeneration is given in baptism—that it is the undoubted spiritual grace of that sacrament. Passages of this kind are continually produced or referred to, as among the writings of the Reformers, and the reformed confessions, and our later divines, expressing the doctrine of regeneration in baptism *as strongly as it is taught in our own formularies*. Mr. Goode's testimony is uniform as to his sense of the clearness and strength with which that doctrine is taught in our formularies. This is all extremely valuable in its way; we can only regret that Mr. Gorham and Mr. Goode attempt, without any reason, to narrow the spiritual benefit of baptism to a selected few, when they themselves admit that, in a certain sense, they are applicable to all.

No one pretends to say that grace is given to all in baptism, so that it cannot be lost. No one can have a right to say, that grace is given to the elect and the reprobate with exactly the same results; or that they are both regarded at any time as equal in God's sight. No one has a right to deny that a real change of life, including a new heart and sincere repentance for past sin, is not for the most part necessary to those adults who have received baptism in infancy. No one can pretend that *such* a change takes place in infancy. Yet, on the other hand, no member of the Church of England has a right to deny that grace is given to all, except the impenitent and unbelieving, in baptism, and that this grace is rightly called regeneration. No member of the Church of England can consistently deny that those who have received grace may fall from it. The Articles declare this fall possible, and describe recovery from it as *only possible* also. Therefore, the wicked may fall, finally, from the grace of regeneration received in baptism.

That parties should be permitted to go on denying the plain and obvious teaching of the Church of England, and yet professing to be her members, is a serious evil; an evil which cannot be permitted, consistently with the security of the Church. We should regret to see any attempt to narrow the limits of those fair and reasonable differences of opinion which have existed for many ages in the Church on the subject of predestination, and the connected mysteries of God's Providence; but liberty ought not to be permitted to degenerate into licence, or members of the Church of England be allowed to continue in the open inculcation of tenets directly opposed to the formularies of the Church. The Bishop of Exeter has, in our opinion, acted with wisdom, as well as with firmness and moral courage, in endeavouring to prevent the inculcation of doctrines opposed to those of the Church of England in reference to baptism; and, although his praiseworthy and Christian zeal has been unsuccessful in the immediate object of preventing a clergyman of unsound doctrine from officiating in his diocese, we yet believe that great real good has been done: for it is not right that the state of things which we have had so long to lament should continue permanently; and it is plain that the proceedings in the case of Gorham must lead to ulterior consequences, which cannot fail to be of great moment; and which will, we hope, lead to the adoption of some measures by ecclesiastical authority, which, in declaring the truth, and in defining the limits within which private opinion may be exercised, may protect the faith of the English Church from the assaults of misguided men, and establish a greater degree of harmony amongst persons of different views than now prevails.

We have dwelt, perhaps, too long on Mr. Goode's view of baptism, and we now turn with pleasure to Archdeacon Wilberforce's able and effective reply. The archdeacon has demonstrated in this work the possibility of combining a belief in baptismal regeneration with views on predestination and election which would be generally considered as "Calvinistic;" and he has thus very satisfactorily met the argument so extensively employed by Mr. Goode and his friends, that the Reformers and their successors, as being more or less Calvinistic, could not have understood that regeneration was given to all infants in baptism. We regard the archdeacon's work as most triumphant in its argument on this head, and in its refutation generally of the attempts to connect the authority of English writers with Mr. Gorham's views. We are not so certain that we are able to concur in the archdeacon's definition of regeneration, which he has not supported by authorities, as far as we have observed. "A new birth unto righteousness," as it is described in the Catechism, does not

convey to our minds precisely the same idea as that of "*Christ taking up his dwelling in man*" (p. 28). The doctrine may be sound, but it strikes us as rather novel in its statement. Passing this over, however, and also some obscurity of language, we must acknowledge the great value of the archdeacon's work, and thank him for so seasonable a contribution to the cause of truth.

We must place before our readers some statement of the archdeacon's views on certain important points. And first, as to the amount and cause of the actual difference on the subject of baptism :—

"The opposition to baptismal regeneration on the part of earnest men seems to have arisen mainly from a fear lest it should do away with the necessity, or detract from the importance, of conversion. I will not enter into controversy, says Mr. Scott, with persons who believe that those who have neglected their baptismal vows 'do still need that great and radical change on which the Scriptures insist.' And even Mr. Goode allows that, 'when the distinction is preserved between this infantine regeneration and that regeneration of heart which is necessary for the salvation of an adult, then (whether or not we agree in the view taken) it seems very unnecessary to raise a further controversy.' Now, had these and other writers always kept this truth before them, a large part of the distrust and hostility which the subject has excited might probably have been avoided. Their feeling plainly was, that the importance of a change of character had not been duly remembered; that regeneration had too often been spoken of as a mere technical, official process; and thus has man's salvation been rested only on his external profession, and not on any real alteration of the heart. Against such an error it was impossible to protest too strongly. But unfortunately, in their earnestness to resist falsehood, men have sometimes sacrificed truth; they have supposed it impossible to exalt regeneration, unless at the same time they disparaged baptism. Thus does Mr. Scott refer, as though it were an admitted truth, to the opinion that, if our Lord's statement respecting the new birth, in the third chapter of St. John, 'relate to baptism, or what necessarily or inseparably accompanies baptism, then it means nothing to us who have received baptism.' Yet no words can possibly be more opposed to the opinions of those who believe in the efficacy of baptismal grace. This misdirection in the efforts of those who desired to vindicate the importance of regeneration has involved a corresponding reaction on the part of some who were jealous for the honour of holy baptism. Insomuch that it was supposed, at one time, that a man could not have a due appreciation of the one if he was disposed to do hearty justice to the other."

We are glad to have Archdeacon Wilberforce's authority in confirmation of our own view, that if persons holding Mr. Gorham's views would consistently and honestly adhere to the distinction here made between infantine regeneration and the "re-

generation of heart " in an adult, the controversy would be much diminished. We think that one party might tolerate the other in the incorrect theological use of the term regeneration, if the other on their part would fairly and consistently admit that there is such a thing as infantine regeneration, which places infants in a state of grace, and which is not restricted to the elect. It is one of the greatest evils of the recent decision, that persons will now be encouraged to deny baptismal regeneration wholly, as Mr. Gorham is permitted to deny it partially.

We must pause for a moment on an assertion of the archdeacon's at p. 119, that " Christian education is based entirely upon a belief in baptismal grace." We have heard this position laid down by the Rev. G. A. Denison in a recent speech, and by others ; and we do not feel satisfied of its correctness. The archdeacon assumes that, in order to conduct a Christian education, we must believe that our children have received a measure of grace. This may be supposed, without necessarily assuming that it has been given by baptismal regeneration, we think. We can conceive a Christian education where baptism has not yet been received. We have sometimes to teach children who have never been baptized. It is therefore plain that a Christian education may be conducted without assuming that regenerating grace *has* been received. We are of opinion, that belief in the Lord Jesus Christ, and in Him crucified, is the foundation on which Christian education is to be based—" Other foundation can no man lay."

We now turn to some valuable remarks of Archdeacon Wilberforce on the possibility of combining a belief in the doctrine of predestination with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The following remarks on St. Augustine are worthy of attention :—

" What can be more decisive than such passages as the following ? ' We say that the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants, although they know it not. For they are ignorant of it, although it is in them, as they are ignorant of their own mind. For it lies in them, as yet unable to be used, like some buried spark, to be quickened by increasing years. Or again, ' It is matter of the utmost wonder, that to some of His sons, whom He has regenerated in Christ, to whom He has given faith, hope, and charity, God does not give perseverance.' We need not to be surprised, therefore, at finding that he speaks of the blessing of election as conferred through the ministration of baptism. And his example illustrates the rule, by which it may be decided whether those who profess agreement with Calvin are really able to accord with the English Church. For it is indifferent whether the charge which has been brought against St. Augustin be well grounded or no, seeing that his error, if it existed, was only one of philosophy, and did not affect his

religious faith. For, by affirming the reality of baptismal grace, he maintained the great truth of our Lord's mediation. And this is a test of universal applicability. Are there any, whose minds dwell exclusively on the beauty and harmony of the divine decrees, whose habit is to refer every thing to God's purpose, but whose language does not do justice to the importance of human responsibility?—still, if the error be only one of philosophy; if it does not lead them to detract from the reality of the mediation of Christ; if they admit that sacramental system through which the Incarnate Son has made his humanity the channel of heavenly gifts; they may be bad reasoners, but sound Christians. But, if their theory induces them to deny the reality of those gifts which are bestowed through sacraments on the members of Christ—if they will not recognise the blessings of that renewed nature, whereby the second Adam restores what was corrupted by the first (of all which the regeneration of infants has been shown to be the test)—how can they hold the great truth of our Lord's mediation, or believe those assertions of the Prayer Book, to which they are required to assent?"

We must also quote an extract from Bishop Bethell to the same effect:—

"The ancient predestinarians never questioned the certainty of regeneration in baptism, because this doctrine was consistent with their theory. For, though they maintained that only the elect or predestinate are endued with the gift of perseverance to the end, and will be finally saved, yet they believed that God bestows at His pleasure every other kind and measure of grace on those persons, from whom He withholds this special grace of perseverance. They therefore held, in common with the rest of the Church, that the forgiveness of sin, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, are generally bestowed in baptism," &c. "This was Augustin's doctrine," &c.—*Bishop Bethell on Regeneration*, cap. ix. p. 140.

Such facts as these show how futile it is to quote passages from writers containing predestinarian views, and then assume that all such persons must have denied baptismal regeneration; and they prove also that, consistently with holding that doctrine in its integrity, there may be differences of opinion on the question of predestination; and that the believers of baptismal regeneration exact no rigid and impracticable uniformity of opinion on points which are fairly open to inquiry, and on which Christians always have been divided in opinion.

Having noticed some of the principal works on either side of this controversy, it is not our purpose to enter into further details on this branch of the subject, but to proceed at once to the recent decision in this very anxious case, its bearings upon the position of Churchmen, and the course which should be pursued by those

who are faithful members of the Church of England. The recent inquiry before the Committee of Privy Council must have left a very painful impression, we should think, on the minds of all who saw theological questions of the most profound and intricate description argued before six laymen (one of whom was a Presbyterian), in order to determine whether a *bishop* were right or wrong in supposing that certain tenets were opposed to those of the Church of England. The obvious want of qualification in several of the judges to decide on a question which involved theological points of the most refined character was most painful and humiliating to the Church. Although this court has declared in its judgment that it "has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought, in any particular, to be the doctrine of the Church of England," still the fact remains, that it has decided, and has the power, by law, of virtually deciding questions of doctrine, by determining whether certain tenets are or are not in accordance with those of the Church of England. The effect of the judgment is to hold out an encouragement to persons maintaining one class of doctrines, and proportionably to cause dissatisfaction to others, who thus see a legal recognition given to tenets which they hold to be untrue in themselves and contradictory to those of the Church of England. Every one feels that a doctrinal decision has, in reality, been made by a court which disclaims its power to settle matters of faith. We hold that the occurrence of any such decision, by a court constituted like the Committee of Privy Council, is an extreme evil in itself, as calculated to supply arguments to the enemies of the Church. Romanists and Dissenters will treat it as an additional proof of what they are always urging, that the Church of England's faith is decided by the State—that the Church is nothing more than the creature of the legislature—and is, therefore, not a genuine or true Church. Many of our own members are greatly scandalized at such a tribunal for the decision of doctrinal questions. There is no security even that the members of the court should be believers, or members of the Church. It may comprise sectarians, as it has on the late occasion. The members are not persons who, from their profession, can be expected to have any such knowledge of theology as would enable them to decide intricate questions.

On all these grounds the present arrangements (created by Act of Parliament some years since) appear to be most objectionable, and dangerous, not only to the peace of the Church, but to the due enforcement and maintenance of its doctrines. A tribunal ought either to be constituted which would possess undoubted authority and qualifications to determine questions affecting the doc-

trines of the Church, or else all such questions should be remitted to the decision of the Church itself in Convocation, or of judges appointed by it. As long as a court, which may include heretics and unbelievers of all kinds, is possessed of the power of putting its own interpretation on the doctrines of the Church of England, and of deciding whether a clergyman shall or shall not teach in the Church, so long will the strongest distrust, uneasiness, and alarm be felt, and a state of things fostered which may lead to results of the most dangerous character to the Church. It would be a great evil if large numbers of pious, zealous, and influential men were driven, in their despair at such a state of things, to go over to Rome. We know, of course, that there are troublesome and unsettled men on both sides of the question, whose loss would not be severely felt; but the evil would be great in all respects, if any considerable secession of men of a better description should occur. We should regret to see Rome thus strengthened; and it must be remembered that, although the judgment has gone in one direction now, it does not follow that all decisions would be in the same direction. For instance, it might happen that the Committee of Council would see no sufficient reason to exclude a person holding Socinian or Sabellian tenets from officiating as a minister of the Church. No one who knows the craft and ingenuity with which such tenets may be put forward and maintained can doubt, we think, that the Committee of Council might easily be induced to decide in their favour. The same might be said of Pelagian and ultra-Arminian doctrines; so that, in truth, all members of the Church have reason to look with apprehension at what may be the future working of the tribunal in question.

We do not purpose to enter on an examination of the particular reasons on which the judgment professes to be based—*Valeant quantum*. The hypothetical meaning attached to some of our services is extended to the baptism of infants, without considering the difference of the cases; and the language of divines on the subject of baptism generally is applied without distinction to the case of infant baptism. The argument, on the whole, scarcely requires an answer, and we refrain from taking up space by attempting it. Our concern is rather with the bearing of the case on the Church of England and the cause of truth. There are a great number of questions and opinions afloat at present in consequence of this judgment, which indicate in some cases an unsettled state of mind, and in others an undue excitement and want of discrimination.

Mr. Maskell, vicar of St. Mary Church, and author of several elaborate works on the “Mediæval Rituals of the Church,” and

on some other subjects, has published a pamphlet which we have perused with more pain than surprise. We have already remarked in this author at various times an overstrained reliance on the truth of mediæval doctrines, and we must add, a too great confidence in the possession of abilities and learning, which has occasionally led to a positiveness of tone, and a somewhat arrogant criticism, which we have long observed with deep regret. The pamphlet which he has now produced is not only offensive in its title, "*The Present Position of the High-Church Party*," but it is decidedly disloyal in its tone. It is in fact a strong attack upon the Church of England, ascribing to her, on the strength of certain Acts of Parliament, the most Erastian doctrines possible. As Mr. Maskell regards such doctrines as heretical, his secession would seem to follow as a matter of course. He takes exactly the ground which all Romanists and Dissenters do in assailing the Church. To refute his statements would be quite superfluous: it has been already done by many of our leading divines in controversy with Romanism; and for an able and satisfactory reply we refer to the Rev. W. J. Irons' "*Present Crisis of the Church of England*."

The earnest and vigorous publications of Messrs. Bennett and Dodsworth on this question evince the great excitement which it has created, and the difficulties which it has raised in many minds. We have not space to enter on an examination of their contents; but we must pause for a little on one publication which possesses peculiar claims on attention. The publication to which we refer is a tract, by the Rev. J. Keble, entitled, "*Church Matters in 1850*." We offer no apology for the following extract:—

"Our consciences, then, are quite clear of any obligation by this engagement to receive the doctrinal decisions of the Privy Council as part of the doctrine of the Church. No number nor amount of them can make the Church of England formally heretical, nor bind us to withdraw from her ministrations. It is not, perhaps, often that men taking a pledge can be quite so sure that they take it according to the meaning of him who imposes it, as we may be sure, that in thus construing the Oath of Supremacy we are just doing what our rulers, from Henry and Elizabeth downwards, have directed us to do.

"What, then, is our condition? It is little to say that it is extremely anomalous and imperfect; that we are, practically, without a court of final appeal in doctrinal causes. We might bear that, as the whole Church has now for centuries borne with her sad divisions and perplexities, because, in the workings of God's inscrutable providence her court of final appeal—a true Œcumenical Council—has been

long denied her. Such a defect does not destroy the Being of the Church Universal—she goes on in her several branches, under appeal to such authority, and ready to submit to it, when it shall please Him to grant it: so neither does the like calamitous deficiency destroy the *Being* of the particular Church of England. But it very seriously affects her *well-being*: more especially now that it comes before us, not merely as a restraint, but as a positive interference and intrusion on the part of an alien power. For,

“1. If we seriously believe that our Lord and Saviour delivered the faith once for all to the saints,—intrusted them with it, as with a precious deposit, which they are not at liberty to make over to others,—then we must believe that it is a great and grievous sin in any church or any clergyman voluntarily to part with that deposit, or any portion of it, into the keeping of aliens, or of any whom He never called to such trust: a great and grievous sin in all; greater and more grievous, in proportion as a man's office comes nearer to that of the holy apostles, to whom and to their successors the treasure was at first committed. Now, we seem in our ignorance to have come very near indeed to that sin; and, being wakened up, we find ourselves on the absolute edge of it. If we go on at all to accept or connive at the claim of the Privy Council to settle controversies of faith, what do we but render ourselves actual and wilful partakers in that sin?

“2. Apart from all such solemn considerations, and regarding the Church simply as we might any other society, what a strange, unsettled condition of things, both in doctrine and discipline, have we to look forward to, if this anomaly is to continue! It was bad enough, when we thought we had an appellate court, namely, Convocation, only that for reasons prudential and charitable we abstained from pressing to have it called into action. Now it will be ten times worse: for those who believe the Church's divine commission will hardly, if ever, think it right to recognise the Privy Council court as fit to overrule the courts of the Church: if they are wronged elsewhere, they will be precluded from appeal; and from defence, if any appeal against them: so that it will necessarily be a partial and one-sided court. The consciousness of its being at hand will of course greatly embolden the propagators of new doctrine among us, and dispirit the defenders of the old. And the scorn is inexpressible which it will bring—nay, which it has already brought—on the English Church; as also the scandal to those who are weak, on the side both of Dissenters and of Roman Catholics.

“3. All this, observe, holds equally true, whether the decision in the present case be according to the Nicene Creed or no. But, if it be adverse, see what presently follows; even granting, what needs to be distinctly proved, that a bishop or archbishop, acting on that decision, would not involve in direct heresy both himself and all in communion with him. The Church indeed will continue as it was (for, even if the court were as legitimate as it is irregular, a judicial decision would not overthrow what is beyond all question synodically decreed); the

Church, and the position of each clergyman in it, will continue in theory just what they were, but in practice all will be confusion. There is no need to put cases in detail: every one will understand at once the kind of difficulties which must and will arise between bishops and priests, dignitaries and inferior clergy, incumbents and curates, visitors and teachers of schools, pastors and parishioners, academical governors and students; in ordination, in institution, in licensing of curates, in catechising, in examinations, in testimonials. There is not an ecclesiastical relation but will be greatly disturbed: from time to time real conflicts will occur, which, if carried out consistently with the decision now supposed, must end in depriving the English Church of the ministry of some, more or fewer, of those who most earnestly desire to help in her labours: some, worn out, will retire from work altogether, many, zealous, but so far unstable, will be driven to forsake and renounce her."

We certainly look on the constitution of the Court of Appeal in Church matters as most strangely defective. If the supremacy of the Crown is permitted to extend in any degree to questions affecting doctrine, the very least that can be expected is, that the members of the court, or some of them at all events, should be competent, from profession and study, to exercise a sound judgment in such questions. This is not now provided for. The Episcopate is wholly excluded. It seems to us that the Bishop of London's proposal would be a vast improvement on such a court. In fact, considering that it is a State Court, for the revision of Church decisions, it seems that the Bishop's proposal is as fair a one as can be; and, though some men see objections in it at first, we think it will finally be approved by all who recognize in the State any power of examining decisions on mixed questions.

And now to touch a painful branch of the subject—we allude to the overstrained excitement caused by the decision, and the disloyal language towards the Church of England, and the avowed doubts which have been heard in so many quarters. In truth, we are most deeply humiliated at much of what we see and hear. Alas! have Church principles degenerated from their natural healthy, honest, and confiding tone, into a peevish and irritable mood, in which real evils are magnified into extravagant dimensions, and principles are overborne and forgotten? We should have no uneasiness, if men would take time to consider the real state of things. But it is, in truth, mortifying to the deepest degree, to see the faith of Churchmen so very fragile, and so open to temptations. A difficulty with some men immediately leads to the most unworthily desponding thoughts, or induces them to give up the contest in utter hopelessness. Such faint hearts

are not really faithful ; they are overthrown by the slightest wind of temptation.

But we trust, as we have ever done, that the influence of such an unhealthy and morbid state of feeling is not very widely spread. We are sure that the mass of the parochial Clergy—the real strength of the Church—are robust in faith, and prepared to struggle in the cause of the Church of England. Their love of that Church is not shaken by any injuries she may suffer from the State, nor do they willingly impute to *her* the unchristian doings of statesmen or of parliaments. If her faith is imperilled, they will stand by her in the contest, for the protection of that faith.

There was a time when the Church's faith was, for nearly a century, endangered on the most vital point of all,—the divinity of the Son of God. The temporal power first sided with the orthodox faith, then attempted to force a latitudinarian compromise upon the Church, and persecuted all those who refused to acquiesce in it. In those times the orthodox faith was condemned, not merely by Emperors and State officials, but by many synods of Bishops. It was not merely heterodox *priests* who were then established by the temporal power, with the aid of subservient bishops, in parochial benefices ; but the bishops themselves, in numberless cases, were either actual heretics, or else acted as heretics directed. Not merely were heretics ordained and placed in the episcopal office, but large numbers of orthodox bishops were deposed and driven from their sees by synods and the State, and heretics were placed in their stead. The bishops of the whole Church, on one occasion, with but a few exceptions, subscribed by compulsion to what was heretical, and “the world was astonished to find itself Arian.” The first bishop of the Church—Liberius of Rome—fell ; and the orthodox faith was visibly maintained only by Athanasius, and a small number of expelled and persecuted bishops.

And yet do we ever find, throughout that long and terrible struggle, that the orthodox ever dreamt of quitting the Church ? Never. They might have joined another communion. There was one ready at hand. The Novatians were orthodox in their doctrine, and maintained generally the catholic system. But it never occurred to Athanasius, or to the other confessors in the cause of Christian truth, to leave the Church under the influence of heresy, even when heresy seemed most triumphant, and to relinquish the struggle by retiring into communion with the Novatians. They felt that they had to contend even to death for the truth of Jesus Christ, and never to relinquish the struggle to rescue the souls of their brethren and children in the faith from the poisonous and fatal errors of Arianism. It was the strong principles of faith in God's blessing on his own cause, and love

for the souls of Christians, that bore them through the deepest discouragements and most unexpected reverses, in steadfast endurance, until the clouds which so long had hung over the Church's faith were dispersed, and heresy was finally and utterly discomfited. That struggle lasted from the reign of Constantine to the time of Theodosius.

In the subsequent controversies on the Monothelite doctrine, the leading bishops of the Oriental Church and the Eastern Emperors, upheld for a long time the heterodox view. Yet no one ever dreamt of forsaking the Church, because it was not possible at once to get rid of false doctrine. During the controversies on Images, the sees were filled by prelates who held contradictory views, and the one party regarded the other as heretical. There were counter decisions on the point by councils calling themselves Œcumenical, and attended by hundreds of bishops. Yet no one thought of forsaking the Church. Nay—to come nearer to our own times—Cranmer and Ridley never dreamt of relinquishing the communion of the Church, even when Romanism was in the ascendant; and neither did Bonner and Gardiner, when they saw bishoprics filled by those whom they regarded as heretics. Each held fast to his position, with the hope of finally succeeding in establishing the faith which he believed to be catholic.

Any one who looks at the facts of ecclesiastical history will see at once that controversies on so difficult and important a subject as that of baptism, in its connexion with predestination, are not to be settled in a day. We attribute the *extent* of division which exists on this subject altogether to the absence of any fitting tribunal for the decision of doctrinal questions. Had the Convocation been permitted to exercise its legal and constitutional rights,—had not the temporal government, by its influence on the heads of the Church, silenced the voice of the Church, in the hope of managing it more easily,—the baptismal controversy would have been set at rest half a century ago. We can conceive nothing more really dangerous to the Church than a chronic disease like that of the dispute on regeneration, and kindred topics; and, great as might have been the risks of bringing such questions before any synod, we yet think that far less evil would have ensued, under any event, than has arisen from the virtual permission given for so long a series of years to inculcate tenets wholly subversive of the doctrines of the English Church. We are persuaded that Convocation would never have made any decision that would not have been both moderate and orthodox; and, although the difficulty of the case is now vastly increased by the suppression of all but the executive authority of the Church for so many years, we are of opinion that a resort to the Convo-

cation would still, on the whole, be the best remedy for the evils around us.

We cannot think that any one, except, perhaps, Mr. Gorham himself, can be satisfied at the present state of things. It can be no real satisfaction to those partisans who have been in the habit of denouncing baptismal regeneration as "a soul-destroying error," and as "contrary to the truth as it is in Jesus," to have it declared by the judicial Committee of Privy Council, and admitted by Mr. Gorham's advocates, that the advocates of this detested doctrine may lawfully act as ministers of the Church of England. On the other hand, it creates universal uneasiness amongst the believers in baptismal regeneration to find a judgment given, which favours the deniers of that doctrine to a certain extent. The controversy will not be in any degree closed by such a decision as has been given,—a decision which bears with it the recognition of its own incompetence and nullity, as regards any authority to decide on matters of faith. The decision will only add to the flame of controversy; it will only suffice to embitter feelings, and will lead to further and stronger struggles.

We deem such a state of things as is likely to ensue, and to be long continued, as fraught with consequences of the most grave importance in every point of view,—consequences which we would earnestly but most respectfully press upon the consideration of the Episcopate, and of all those members of the Clergy whose position and character gives them weight and influence. We are anxious to regard the matter in such a point of view as may appeal to the minds of men of all parties and schools, who are capable of exercising a dispassionate judgment on the question, and who look beyond the excitement of the present controversy to the general interests of the Church of England.

And, in the first place, to speak of the interests of truth itself, as stated and expressed in the authorised formularies of the English Church, we think that every fair-minded and intelligent observer must feel that, amidst the controversies so long carried on, there has been much said which is really and truly inconsistent with the belief of the Church of England, and with sound doctrine. Exaggerated, false, and scandalous doctrines have been broached, and the minds of the people have been disturbed in various directions; in many instances a spirit of hostility has been engendered against the formularies of the Church; pious men have been induced to forsake her in consequence; and belief has become widely unsettled on the important point of regeneration.

And, in the next place, to speak of the evils hence arising to the Church. We must, in the first place, speak of the incalculable harm of division in itself, the diminution of Christian charity

and benevolence, the impediments which are offered to co-operation in religious undertakings, the many bad effects which arise from divided courses of action. We are too much accustomed to such things, but still the suffering and the evil caused by them are very great. It is a lamentable fact that in too many places the clergy are separated by an impassable line, and hold no intercourse. In some places, members of the same communion look on each other as heretics, and entertain more charitable feelings towards members of different communions. We need not speak of the moral tendencies and effects of such a state of things. Divisions like these tend to diminish the growth of Christian holiness: they are opposed to the best interests of piety and devotion; they are deeply injurious to the efficiency of the Church. Nothing can be more deplorable than either the existence of differences which can in any degree justify the hostile feelings which exist, or the great violence of parties, if the differences between them do not authorize such extreme courses. In either case the Church is in a very unsatisfactory state.

But now, to take another view of the question. Is it safe, for the general interests of the Church, regarded in its capacity of the national Established Church, that the present controversies should be permitted to become permanent? We think there can be very little doubt on this subject. Be it remembered that the Church of England is no longer in such a position of ascendancy, that she can afford to act exactly as if she were in the political position she occupied a century ago. We have lost the exclusive position we then occupied. We are surrounded by powerful and vigilant enemies, who have forced their way into political power and influence, in spite of all the opposition we could make. Romanism and Dissent confront us in Parliament; and what is still worse, if possible, is the spirit of latitudinarian indifference, the spirit of heartless godlessness, of irreligious cupidity, of revolutionary innovation, which *exists* in the Legislature, and is ready to combine with any allies for the destruction of existing institutions. To believe that these circumstances do not deeply affect the Church, and throw a shadow over her prospects, is, we think, impossible. Now then, we do say with confidence, that the continuance of so extensive a division in the Church as exists, is most highly perilous to our general interest at present. We cannot help feeling alarm at the prospect of its further continuance without check. Were the Church any thing like a united body, did it possess the power of joining even for the promotion of its most vital interests and securities, we should feel little apprehension; but to permit it much longer to be a divided body, before a host of enemies, an unscrupulous Parliament, and an impoverished and discontented

nation,—to present it in this point of view, while it is showing so many signs of resistance to the will of leading parties, would, we think, be a fearful risk. It may not be possible to escape from this position, but we are convinced that no effort ought to be spared for the purpose of endeavouring to escape from it. The Church is weakened by her divisions, at the time when her strength requires to be concentrated, as far as possible, to maintain her position.

Our readers will do us the justice of admitting, that it has been our effort to promote harmony and mutual forbearance among Churchmen. We have never promoted party-spirit, or attempted to pass sentences of condemnation on "Evangelicals." But we are convinced that a great change has come upon the Church.

We are of opinion that the time has arrived in which the risk, whatever they may be, of a doctrinal decision by the authority of the collective Church of England, are far less than those to be apprehended from leaving controversy to continue. Every one must be anxious—most deeply anxious at such a prospect. But we think there is now no alternative. If prelates pass judgment on the question in their individual capacity, it may be apprehended that the division and excitement will only be continually augmented because we have no reason to expect such unanimity as might amount to a combined judgment of the whole. Independently of this, we think that subjects of so intricate and anxious a character should not be left to individual judgment, but should be settled after lengthened consideration, conference, and study. The condemnation of Tractarian doctrines here furnishes no sufficient precedent: it does not at all follow that there would be either so united a judgment, or so unequal a division of parties as there was in that case. Something more authoritative is now requisite. Something which shall be distinctly recognized as the voice of the Church of England herself.

We think that Convocation is *the* tribunal which alone would supply the authority needed. We should, ourselves, have no objection to see the question submitted to the episcopate alone; but we do not think such a measure would give satisfaction. There are three objections to such a plan. (1.) The episcopate is considered by many as too much under the influence of Government to decide freely. (2.) It is not the recognized and ordinary synod which has acted since the Reformation. (3.) The anxiety which exists would induce dissatisfaction, if the clergy by their representatives were *excluded* from the decision of questions in which they have hitherto been permitted to take part by the law of the land. We, therefore, look on Convocation as the only synod that could be safely employed.

With reference to the constitution of Convocation we are ready to admit that it might possibly be more perfect in theory; but we must remember that it remains in the same state as it has for six centuries, and is in the same state as when it authorized our present formularies. It comprises in one house the Bishops of the Church, and in the other a certain number of the second order of the clergy holding important offices in the Church, and the elected representatives of the whole body of the clergy. The authority of such a body is as great as any synod of the English Church could possess.

With reference to the qualifications of the members of Convocation to discuss and examine the questions now disturbing the Church, we think there is no reason to entertain any doubt. In the first place, the great body of its members hold their places as of right, and therefore cannot be returned under any temporary appointment. In the next place, the present representatives of the clergy were returned when there was no contemplation of the discussion of any such question by Convocation, and therefore they may be supposed to represent the general mind of the clergy.

It is possibly, in some instances, abler men might have been returned if it had been expected that Convocation was to act; but we think the great advantage is, that the present members of Convocation were not chosen at a contested election.

And now, as regards the theological attainments of the members of Convocation, we see no reason to doubt that, as a body, they are sufficiently qualified. Supposing that some of their members are not much versed in such questions, still it must be remembered, that the ancient synods contained many bishops who were not very learned, but rather the reverse. And besides this, we should add that no question such as is now disturbing the Church, ought to be decided until after a very lengthened inquiry.

The congregation appointed at Rome to examine the writings of Jansenius, and the complicated doctrines connected with them, took two years in making their inquiries; and we think that any decision in the present case, in order to be satisfactory, and to carry weight, ought to be based on extensive examination, and on a candid and dispassionate inquiry. If any of the members of Convocation are not prepared at once, and without further inquiry, to pronounce their decision on the very complicated and difficult questions in debate, they could at least prepare themselves for the giving of an opinion by careful study. We must express our own opinion, that to pronounce a really sound judgment, taking in the question in its various relations, is no easy task, even to men of great strength and intelligence.

It has always been the practice, in synods of the Church, to

submit questions to the fullest examination, before any resolution is come to; and if this course were pursued in the present instance, we do not think there would be any danger either of an unworthy compromise of truth, or of any decision which would drive large numbers of persons from the Church's communion.

The Convocation includes amongst its members many representatives of each side of the question, and many others whose views are not before the public. We think it must be regarded therefore as an impartial tribunal, while it possesses the supreme authority in the Church of England. A body which includes the hierarchy in one house (without whose consent no measure could pass), and which includes in the other house all the presbyters of the Church, whose station, age, and mode of appointment afford reasonable grounds for expecting moderation, and a regard to practical results, is, we think, most unlikely to wish to come to any decision which would have the effect of rending the Church asunder; and we will express a strong conviction, that though there *are* differences of the most striking kind in the Church, and more differences than are tolerable, yet the differences existing between the *greater* numbers on each side, are not such as to forbid mutual forbearance in regard to those points, or to render the task of a synod altogether a hopeless one.

We have been anxious to dwell on such practical considerations as the above, with a view to show that there would not be so much difficulty as many persons might be inclined to anticipate from any meeting of Convocation. We will advance further, to state the mode of proceeding which might be calculated to obviate the further inconveniences which might be anticipated, and to afford a prospect of a satisfactory solution of our present difficulties.

It would be desirable, we think, that the Convocation of the province of York should be transferred by the Queen's writ or letters patent, and by the metropolitan, to London, and united to the Convocation of the province of Canterbury, and that the united Convocation should be declared by its own first act and by the Sovereign to be a national synod of the Church of England.

The subject-matter for consideration would be "the differences within the Church on the subject of baptismal regeneration, with a view to the termination of controversies, and a settlement of the doctrine of the Church on those points." This subject would be placed before the Convocation by some authority, either that of the State alone, or of the State at the request of the Bishops, or some of them. The first step to be taken, before entering into any discussions or controversies, should, we think, be the appointment of a joint committee of the two houses of

Convocation, to regulate the *mode of proceeding* in both houses, and to examine *the state of the controversies* in the Church—that is, to ascertain what views and statements are, and have been, put forward, which seem to merit attention. The object of this inquiry would be, to ascertain and place before Convocation, in some authentic form, an exposition of the statements and modes of speaking, which appear to be censurable or prejudicial to the peace of the Church. We should think that the result of such an inquiry would disclose many statements which would meet with general disapproval; and the repression of extreme, erroneous, and rash statements on both sides, would, we think, tend, as much as any thing else, to the restoration of sufficient unity in the Church.

But this alone would be insufficient, unless it were accompanied by a statement of the positive doctrine of the Church of England in the matter of baptismal regeneration. And here, it may be imagined, would be the signal for a violent contest and struggle in Convocation itself. We do not think this need be the case, if the proceedings are regulated in a certain way. We think, that *viva voce* discussion, except perhaps by advocates, as before an Ecclesiastical Court, or by selected Divines, should be avoided on many accounts. Various scandals might be created, in the present state of the public press, and the authority and dignity of the synod might be diminished, were hasty words permitted to escape any one. The total alteration of the circumstances and habits of the times, and the facilities for criticism of a certain kind professed by the lowest classes, renders it, in our view, essential that the proceedings of synods should be conducted, as much as possible, on paper. The mode of proceeding, which seems to us as desirable, is this: a committee of each house should be elected, and should be united in one body, for the purpose of preparing a very few questions on the doctrine of baptism, calculated to elicit the judgment of the members of Convocation, as to the doctrine of the Church of England on the point. These questions, when prepared, should be considered by both houses, and if deemed insufficient or obscure in any point, should be amended. When the questions were finally agreed on, they should be submitted on paper to every member of Convocation, to be answered on paper within assigned limits, and within a certain number of months. Sufficient space should be allowed for full consideration of the subject.

When the answers had been all received, the Convocation should meet again, and the questions having been read separately, the answers to each should be read *seriatim*. In this way the judgment of the synod as to the doctrine of the Church would be solemnly and effectively delivered, without risk of any scandal.

And the proceedings would take the form which was usual in ancient synods.

The next step would be, to appoint a committee of both houses for the purpose of drawing up a judgment or decision stating the doctrine of the Church of England. In this judgment we should think that if the positive declarations of the Church of England in her various formularies—declarations, the plainness and stringency of which is admitted by all parties—were adhered to as far as possible, without going beyond her own expressions, the truth would be secured on all sides, and general satisfaction would be felt. On the other hand, we think that to this positive declaration should be annexed some general declaration, that it was not the purpose of the Church to enforce a uniformity of opinion on certain mysterious and difficult doctrines connected with the Divine predestination. And this ought to be followed up by the condemnation of certain modes of speaking calculated to bring contempt on the sacrament and to promote division, requiring all clergy to abstain from such language in future on penalty of suspension.

This decision should be submitted to each house of Convocation in a private session or general committee, and, after having received the necessary emendations, should be finally passed in a public session.

It appears to us, that such a mode of proceeding as we have attempted to sketch, would afford a fair prospect of arriving at a safe and satisfactory conclusion, and of allaying the great excitement and divisions which now exist, and which will continue to increase, if some mode be not taken to set them at rest. The Church of England is extremely endangered by the continuance of the present divisions. These angry disputes ought to be put an end to. We think it very possible, that some ultra and extreme men on either side might fall away from the Church if any decision were made. But we think such a risk indefinitely less than that of leaving the present controversy to rage in the Church unchecked. The loss of a certain number of individuals would be nothing in comparison with the permanent weakness of the whole Church. We cannot believe that any decision of Convocation would really narrow the legitimate limits of private opinion in the Church of England, or thoughtlessly and inconsiderately define more than the Church herself has already defined. We shall not have the slightest apprehension of the result, if there be a sufficient degree of inquiry and of deliberation. We feel assured that the effect would be to leave diversities of opinion, while it ensured uniformity in belief, and compelled moderation of language.

We now come to consider the course which should be pursued

by the advocates of sound doctrine in the present circumstances. To permit the decision of the Committee of Privy Council to pass without remark and protest, would be as inexpedient and wrong, as it would be impossible. The strong and too excited feelings of men must find some immediate vent; and we see no evil in protests, as affording a relief to the exigencies of many minds. Such protests, however, are of a transitory character, and have no consequences of a practical nature. They may serve for a particular crisis, but they are not calculated to make any permanent impression, or to lead to the final settlement of the question. The right step to be taken is, we think, to call for the decision of the controversies on the subject of regeneration by the Convocation of the Church of England. We should recommend men to direct their attention to this single point; and to press it in every possible way, by petitions and memorials to the Crown, archbishops, and bishops, pointing out the urgent necessity for some authoritative decision, with a view to remove the great evils of a controversy which has so long been permitted to weaken and divide the Church.

Need we add to this, that there is another remedy which is to be resorted to by all faithful members of the Church? Reliance on the Divine protection, with continual prayer for guidance amidst the great dangers and difficulties of the present time, are, we hope, the habitual resources of many amongst us; and to the sanctifying, tranquillizing, and enlightening influences thence resulting, we look with greater hope than to any contrivances of mere human wisdom. In such a spirit of firm reliance, combined with a spirit of genuine and enlarged charity, we feel hopeful that Churchmen will face the difficulties of their position; and, remote alike from a spirit of latitudinarian compromise, or of sectarian dogmatism, will steadfastly seek for the establishment of the truth, and the removal of the scandals which now abound. To remain apathetic and inactive in the present grave circumstances, would be injurious at once to the truth of Christian doctrine, and to the best interests of the Church of England. An effort to obtain the settlement of most dangerous and exciting controversies, cannot be justly regarded as any improper disturbance of the Church. It is, on the contrary, the act of true peace-makers. It was not the act of disturbers of the Church, or of agitators, to lay before the Apostolic council at Jerusalem the controversies in reference to the obligation of the law. Need we despair of a similar conclusion in giving peace to the Church now, if the same spirit of moderation and of inquiry be pursued which guided the synod at Jerusalem? Whether so great a blessing be in store for us we cannot foretell, but we heartily pray that it may be so.

In the mean time, we are not likely to see any intermission of controversy on the subject of this article. In truth, the question is one which is of no transient interest: it has been troubling the Church for the last thirty or forty years; and it directly affects the doctrines of the Gospel. In proportion as religious zeal and earnestness increase, more anxiety is felt on the subject. We are now only at the commencement of troubles which have no visible termination but in ruin, unless they be arrested in time. Those troubles cannot be stayed by force, by attempts at intimidation, or by such bungling and ill-contrived schemes of accommodation between opposing parties, as would give no satisfaction to either. The only mode in which they can be settled is by an attempt to settle them, not merely on grounds of policy, or with a view to conciliation, but under a sense of duty to truth, and to the God of truth. If the case be treated in this spirit of faith, the Divine blessing may be reasonably expected, and thus alone will peace be obtained.

At present there can be no peace: a judgment has been given which leaves the whole case in more complexity than ever. We hear each day of solemn protests against the measure; and those protests deeply affect the public mind. The Rev. George Denison has the distinction of leading the way in the remarkable documents which follow.

“PROTEST A.

“In the name of the most Holy Trinity.—Amen.

“Whereas the Universal Church alone possesses, by the commission and command of its Divine Founder, the power of defining in matter of doctrine; and, subject to the same, the Church of England alone possesses, within its sphere, the power of interpreting and declaring the intention of such definitions as the Universal Church has framed;—

“And whereas a power to interpret formularies of the Church by a final judicial sentence, the Synods of the Church not being, in practice, admitted to declare the doctrine of the Church, becomes in effect a power to declare and make such interpretations binding upon the Church;—

“And whereas by the suit of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, as well as by the case of *Escott v. Mastin*, in the year 1842, it appears that the Crown, through a Court constituted by Act of Parliament alone, claims and exercises a power to confirm, reserve, or vary, by a final judicial sentence, the decisions and interpretations of the Courts of the Church in matters of doctrine;—

“And whereas in the present state of the law nothing hinders but that an interpretation which shall have been judged to be unsound by the Courts of the Church may be finally declared to be sound by the said Judicial Committee; or, that a person who shall have been judged to

be unfit for cure of souls by the spiritual tribunal may be declared to be fit for cure of souls by the civil power ;—

“ And whereas the existence of such state of the law cannot be reconciled with the Divine constitution and office of the Church, and is contrary to the law of Christ ;—

“ And whereas the exercise of power in such matters, under such state of the law, endangers the public maintenance of the faith of Christ ;—

“ And whereas the existence of such a state of things is a grievance of conscience ;—

“ And whereas no judgment pronounced by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, in respect of matters of doctrine, can be accepted by the Church ;—

“ I, George Anthony Denison, Clerk, M.A., Vicar of East Brent, in the county of Somerset, and diocese of Bath and Wells, do hereby enter my solemn protest against the state of the law which empowers the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to take cognizance of matters of doctrine, and against the exercise of that power by the said Judicial Committee in each particular case ; and I do hereby pledge myself to use all lawful means within my reach to prevent the continuance of such state of the law, and of the power claimed and exercised under the same.

(Signed)

“ GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

“ East Brent, 4th Sunday in Lent, March 10, 1850.

“ Read in the vestry of the parish church of East Brent, in the presence of the churchwardens and other witnesses, and copies delivered to the churchwardens, and transmitted to the Bishop, Sunday, March 10, 1850.

“ PROTEST B.

“ In the name of the most Holy Trinity.—Amen.

“ I. Whereas the Church of England is a branch of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in virtue thereof holds, absolutely and exclusively, all the doctrines of the Catholic faith ;—

“ II. And whereas George Cornelius Gorham, Clerk, B.D., Priest of the Church of England, has formally denied the Catholic faith in respect of the holy sacrament of baptism ;—

“ And whereas the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has, in the case of *Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter*, reversed the judgment of the Church Court, and has pronounced, by final sentence, the said George Cornelius Gorham to be fit to be instituted by the Bishop to a benefice with cure of souls ;—

“ And whereas this sentence is necessarily false ;—

“ And whereas such sentence gives public legal sanction to the teaching of false doctrine, and therein and thereby has a great and manifest tendency to lead into error of doctrine, or to encourage to persevere in error of doctrine, or to plunge finally into heresy, all such as are tempted, in one degree or another, to deny the faith of Christ in respect of the holy sacrament of baptism ;—

“ And whereas such sentence does injury and dishonour to Christ and to His Holy Church ;—

“ And whereas all, who with a full knowledge of the intent, meaning, and purpose of such sentence, are, or shall be, concerned in promulging or executing it, and all who, with a like knowledge, shall approve of, or acquiesce in it, are or will be involved in heresy ;—

“ And whereas it has become necessary—in consequence of such sentence—that the Church of England should free herself from any participation in the guilt thereof by proceeding, *without delay*, to make some further formal declaration in respect of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism ;—

“ I, George Anthony Denison, Clerk, M.A., Vicar of East Brent, in the county of Somerset, and diocese of Bath and Wells, do hereby enter my solemn protest against the said sentence of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and do warn all the Christian people of this parish to beware of allowing themselves to be moved or influenced thereby in the least degree ; and I do also hereby pledge myself to use all lawful means within my reach to assist in obtaining, without delay, some further formal declaration, by a lawful Synod of the Church of England as to what is, and what is not, the doctrine of the Church of England in respect of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism.

(Signed)

“ GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

“ East Brent, 4th Sunday in Lent, March 10, 1850.

“ Read in the vestry of the parish church of East Brent, in the presence of the churchwardens and other witnesses, and copies delivered to the churchwardens, and transmitted to the Bishop, Sunday, March 10, 1850.”

We must confess that our first impulse in perusing the above documents was to regret the course taken by Mr. Denison, and to regard his statements as overstrained and violent. But more attentive consideration has induced us to alter our opinion, both as regards the sentiments expressed and the mode of expression. This protest was not intended merely to express the author's own private sentiments, or to relieve his own feelings. It was invested with every degree of formality; evidently for the purpose of meeting the imperative demand for such protests arising from the unsettled state of mind of various Churchmen, who deemed the Church of England in danger of becoming heretical in the matter of baptism, if no protest against the decision of the Committee of Council were made. His protest appears throughout to consider the evil and danger in the present case to arise from the suppression of the synods of the Church, which gives to the decisions of the Committee of Council a weight they ought not to possess; and he denies to that Committee only the power which it repudiates itself—the decision of controversies of faith. On the whole, the more we examine Mr. Denison's protests, the more we are satisfied of *their propriety* in all respects; and the insults of the “Times,” and

the threats of Government, will only tend to raise Mr. Denison's influence, and increase the widely-extended sympathy which he possesses. In his contrast to the principles of the "Times," Mr. Denison appears in the light of a champion of ecclesiastical liberties; and we intreat him as such to act with the caution and deliberation, as well as the resolution which such a position imperatively demands.

We do not feel altogether satisfied with some parts of the following protest, subscribed, as it is, with names which must command general respect:—

RESOLUTIONS.

" 1. That whatever, at the present time, be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.

" 2. That the remission of original sin to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism is an essential part of the Article 'One Baptism for the remission of sins.'

" 3. That—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence—such sentence, while it does not deny the liberty of holding that Article in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction the assertion that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace, (whereof Holy Scripture and the Church are wholly silent,) thereby rendering the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious.

" 4. That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an Article of the Creed, contradictory of the essential meaning of that Article, is, in truth and in fact, to abandon that Article.

" 5. That, inasmuch as the Faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed, destroys the Divine Foundation upon which alone the entire Faith is propounded by the Church.

" 6. That any portion of the Church which does so abandon the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed forfeits, not only the Catholic doctrine in that Article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a Member of the Universal Church.

" 7. That, by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act, such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to its members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins.

" 8. That all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church ought to be taken without delay, to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of holy baptism, impugned by the recent sentence: as, for instance, by praying licence for the Church

in Convocation to declare that doctrine: or by obtaining an Act of Parliament, to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual.

“9. That, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of holy baptism, impugned by the said sentence.

“H. E. MANNING, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester.

ROBERT J. WILBERFORCE, M.A., Archdeacon of the East Riding.

THOMAS THORP, B.D., Archdeacon of Bristol.

W. H. MILL, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley.

W. DODSWORTH, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras.

W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

HENRY W. WILBERFORCE, M.A., Vicar of East Farleigh.

JOHN C. TALBOT, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.

RICHARD CAVENDISH, M.A.

EDWARD BADELEY, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.

JAMES R. HOPE, D.C.L., Barrister-at-Law.”

If this protest be intended for general adoption, it appears to us that it is not so drawn up as to obtain the assent of very many who strongly object to the recent decision. It is very true that to deny an article of the Creed is heresy. Still we should not have thought it expedient in the present temper of men's minds to contemplate, so distinctly as this document does, the abandonment of an article of the Creed by the Church of England. We do not like this tone. We should prefer to see men declaring, indeed, the evils of the judgment that has passed, and its dangers, but looking in a more hopeful spirit to the remedy of these evils. Perhaps our criticism is too captious; but we look with anxiety at a document signed with such names. It is, indeed, one of the most important documents that has come before us for years; and we have no doubt that it will have the greatest weight. Associations of Churchmen in all parts of the country are also joining in protesting against the recent decision; and the daily increase of publications on the subject shows the intense and lively interest of all classes; and the controversy on which we have now entered bids fair to endure for years to come with equal or increasing strength. Shall this be so? Shall we be left to waste our strength by incessant quarrelling? or will any attempt be made to settle our controversies by authority? It is, in our view, the only remaining hope for the Church.

ART. V.—*The Life of Torquato Tasso.* By the Rev. R. MILMAN.
2 vols. London: Colburn. 1850.

THERE are few things which strike a reflecting mind more keenly than the ignorance of man. It was said by one of the wisest of our species, that in proportion as his actual knowledge increased, so did his perception of his own want of knowledge; so that the more he knew, the less he seemed to know; and the utmost triumph of his knowledge was to know that he knew nothing.

How little do we know of the mighty universe which we inhabit: of the higher heaven we have but a faint and feeble glimmering; of the lower depth but a flickering far-off reflection. And how many bright worlds are careering around us in the appointed orbits which they have trod since the day in which they were created—worlds which we see and wonder at, and whose speechless voices we hear—yet of which we know nothing. And if, leaving heaven and hell and the celestial system, we look upon the things nearer home, still the same thought strikes us—we know nothing. The sun, which under the Divine Will gives life and light to every earthly formation, remains an unknown wonder—a marvel unintelligible; the moon, which for countless ages has tracked our course through æther, the humble though beautiful attendant of mother earth, what know we of her life? her destiny? save as concerns a portion of her office to our parent. Nearer still,—we see the clouds arise, we hear the winds blow, yet the clouds arise without our knowledge, and the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we cannot tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth. We can calculate, speculate, divide, construct, theorize, and dream, yet to any being really acquainted with the truths of nature, our thoughts must appear lighter than vanity itself. Take a nearer view still—look at the fowls of the air and the beasts of the earth, the trees of the forest and the herbs of the field, and all those forms animate or inanimate, whose home is in the depths of the ocean or the bowels of the earth. How little do we really *know* of them; we observe phenomena, and dot them down and arrange them, and draw our wise conclusions from them; yet it may safely be said, that the smallest living creature, nay, the meanest herb, contains more that we do not know than the round world contains of what we do.

And nearer still,—how little do we know of the real history of the globe which we inhabit; the history of those living creatures

of our own species who have been born, and grown up, and died since the days when the earth was divided amongst the children of Noah. How often do we find reliques of nations and empires of whom nothing but the name remains, and scarcely that. And even in the histories of those states which have been recorded, how many outward facts are in dispute, how many inward agencies of mighty influence are entirely misapprehended and misappreciated, if not utterly unknown! Why! in our own recollection there have been disputes as to which of the contending armies deserved the honour of gaining a victory. Nay, even in biography, which confining itself to a more simple, and therefore a more easily cognizable subject, should, one would *à priori* think, be free from such doubts and difficulties—mistakes prevail, and disputes arise, till the very ground upon which our hero stands, shakes under him, and, like some eastern genie, changing from hour to hour, he either vanishes altogether, or assumes a form totally different from that which was familiar to our original impressions.

And thus, whilst the founders of mighty empires are now worshipped as demi-gods, and anon deprived altogether of a personal being; whilst statesmen are one day lauded as patriots, and before night hooted as traitors; whilst one generation calls the victor a hero, and a succeeding one styles him a brigand—the race of poets shares the common lot.

From disputing the birthplace, the era, and the fortunes of the greatest of poets, we have come to doubt of his existence; not we individually, but we collectively; the men of this generation. No! forbid it taste, forbid it justice, forbid it common sense, that we should, for the veriest fractional part of the millesimal portion of a second, doubt the reality of Homer's being. He who does so can have no soul for poetry, no perception of unity, no power of appreciating the masterpiece of man. What Scott beautifully said on another subject may well be applied to such a sceptic:—

“If such there breathe, go mark him well,
For him no minstrel raptures swell.”

In sober truth, and without irreverence, we avow it, that the spirit which cannot see unity and design in the *Iliad*, is more or less the same as that which ignores them in the universe. Let critics of this description confine themselves to works within their sphere—a fresh edition, for instance, of the “*Critica Nova Zealandica Futura*,” “*Mother Hubbard*,” is suited to their comprehension—*Ne sutor ultra crepidam*.

And now that we have got on the theme, we would willingly throw down the gauntlet for a few more of the injured sons of song; especially our own great Shakspeare, whose life, and prin-

ciples, and mighty genius, and consummate art, have been assailed by pigmies, small, wicked, and mischievous, whose effusions satisfactorily prove that they ought never to have been allowed the use of a copy-book.

And whither does all this tend? It tends to this, that the great and sweet poet, Torquato Tasso, is not exempt from the common destiny of men and of poets, and that the universal ignorance of which we have spoken is further exemplified in the conflicting accounts of his life and sorrows which have come down to us.

The author of the life of Tasso, which stands at the head of this article, is not the Dean of St. Paul's, as from the subject of the work the reader might be led to imagine, but his nephew, the Rev. R. Milman, Vicar of Chaddleworth, in the county of Berks.

"In hazarding," says he, "a new biography of Tasso, my object has been to represent his character, sometimes unjustly depreciated, in its true colours: to narrate the vicissitudes and trials he underwent, to trace their effect upon his mind, to show the good purposes to which they were secretly and mercifully directed; and thus to exhibit one of those rare examples, when great genius and a vivid imagination, meeting with disappointment and oppression, are still not hardened into misanthropy and selfishness, but, on the contrary, improved and chastened in the ordeal through which they pass.

"At the same time, the changing and restless course of Tasso's history, leading us from country to country, and city to city, conducting into various and most opposite scenes, hurrying to and fro from one extreme of life to the other, calling up before us in animated characters the school, the college, the court, the prison, the monastery, the palace, the amusement, shows, studies, spectacles, devotions, tyrannies, through which, as through an intricate labyrinth, we with difficulty follow the clue of his fortunes, will present us, I trust, with a lively delineation of Italian manners and feelings, in the latter half of the famous sixteenth century."—vol. i. pp. 1, 2.

"If this history" (Mr. Milman thus concludes his introduction) "shall warn any youth of the dangers which attend a vivid imagination, and the indulgence of its glittering day-dreams; of the sad consequences often entailed upon one sin; of the use and excellence of habits of perseverance; of the gracious end and purposes of disappointment and affliction; of the value of early devotion, often, even when lost amidst sin and vanity for a season, re-appearing in the earnestness and depth of sincere repentance, and bearing, if late, yet blessed and abundant fruit, my labours will be a source to me of the deepest thankfulness."—vol. i. p. 10.

Pleasingly and ably has the biographer performed his task, though there are here and there blunders and blemishes which we shall at once point out, in the hope that they will be rectified in a

second edition. In reading the work rapidly through, two mistakes caught our attention; the first occurs at p. 132 of the first volume, where he says that "Tasso reached Ferrara to enter the service of Ippolito, the second cardinal then living of the d'Este family." Tasso's patron, however, as Mr. Milman himself informs us frequently, both before and afterwards, was the Cardinal Luigi d'Este.

This is scarcely more than an error of transcription. The second mistake is less excusable; it regards the date of "a remarkable memorial, intended apparently as a will."

"The date," says Mr. Milman, "1573 is certainly a mistake for 1570, and from the will it appears that the remains of Bernardo had been transferred, from St. Egidio in Mantua, to the Church of St. Paul in Ferrara, through the interest, doubtless, of the Cardinal d'Este."—vol. i. p. 165.

Previously, we had been informed that

"Bernardo's malady rapidly increased after his son's arrival; and on the 4th of September he died, to the deep grief of Torquato, and the great regret of the Duke of Mantua, his patron. By that prince's order, his body was transferred to Mantua, and buried in the Church of St. Egidio in that city, under a marble monument, with the simple inscription

OSSA BERNARDI TASSI.

This, however, did not long remain: it fell among the sepulchres which were removed or broken down, when Pope Gregory XIII. published an order for the demolition of all tombs much elevated above the pavement, judging that they interfered with the reverence due to the altar. Bernardo's bones were next transferred to the churchyard, and there interred for awhile without any mark of distinction."—vol. i. pp. 155, 156.

Now it happens that Gregory XIII. did not become Pope till 1572, and it consequently follows that whatever zeal and expedition he exercised in demolishing the tombs in question, he could not have effected it more than two years before he commenced it. Even retrospective acts can only affect the present and the future; and the most determined advocates of the papal prerogative will scarcely extend its efficacy so far. So after all, it turns out that Tasso is *right*, and his biographer *wrong*. It is easy to see how the mistake has arisen. The memorandum begins thus:—

"Because life is uncertain, if it pleases God to dispose otherwise of me in my journey to France, I pray the Signor Ercole Rondinelli to take care of some of my effects," &c,

Now Tasso did go into France in 1570, and not in 1573. Therefore &c. Q. E. D., says Mr. Milman. But here, like many other skilful reasoners, he falls the victim to a fallacy. Tasso does not write after a journey to France and state that he had completed it; but he writes under the impression that he is just about to undertake one. All, therefore, that is proved by the date in question is, that in 1573 the poet had serious thoughts of making a journey to France, (probably in company with Cardinal Luigi,) a journey which never took place, and that in the apparently near prospect of this event he wrote the will.

It will be seen, that neither of these errors affect in any degree the plot, so to speak, nor do they interfere with the conduct of the biography, or the moral which the writer carefully draws throughout; still they are errors, and as such should be excided.

With regard to blemishes, such as faults of style or diction, the following does not read well (vol. i. p. 157): "The nuptials were honoured with a fine canzone by Tasso, who was rewarded with several favours and gifts by the two spouses." We do not at least think, that had Tasso written his canzone in English, he would have spoken of "the two spouses;" we have heard of spouse, and spousey too, but the plurals are not euphonious. The singular even is used rather too frequently by this author, as in vol. i. p. 130, vol. ii. p. 226; and in vol. ii. p. 91, we have "THE TWO SPOUSES" again.

There are also many paragraphs which would acquire either strength or elegance by being slightly pruned; and in the 115th page of the second volume he has volunteered the following droll translation of the famous *πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ* of Sophocles:

"Many a thing hath craft and skill,
But man is craftier, wiser still;
And wondrous cures does he devise,
For strange, resistless maladies."

It is easy to see that it was not Tasso himself, but only his biographer who manufactured these lines.

Notwithstanding, however, these little peccadilloes, the work before us is one which we can most warmly recommend to our readers. We have derived very great pleasure from perusing it ourselves, and doubt not but that they would do the same. The style, though often careless, is always pleasant; frequently rich in beauty, and sometimes even sublime. The varied scenes of Tasso's eventful career are vividly brought before the eye; the characters of his friends and enemies, his companions and patrons, his rivals and protectors, are clearly depicted. The course of his life, the culture of his mind, the growth of his intellect, are

carefully portrayed. The vast and beautiful magnificence of his noble genius is finely exhibited. The yet more wonderful history of his inner life is traced with a master's hand; we seem whilst following the author to walk beside the sufferer, and receive a vivid yet mystical impression, such as might be produced on the mind by painting set to music; that is to say paintings of various scenes in the hero's life, illustrated by the most touching and appropriate music; now breathing ardent hope, now muttering anxious fear, now rising into passion, now dying into melancholy—now expressing the craft and malice of his enemies—now whispering the unuttered secret of his life—now exerting all its deepest power to tell the gloomy horrors of the hospital of Santa Anna; and then suddenly rushing into light to celebrate the advent of his ideal guests.

The whole story is one in every way of the deepest interest, and Mr. Milman is entirely absorbed in his subject. The catastrophe (to use a technical term for want of a better) surpasses almost any thing in real life, except perhaps the coronation of the skeleton of Inez de Castro.

Tasso was sprung from a very ancient and very noble family, many branches of which had acquired considerable wealth by superintending the imperial posts; the system of which was either invented or revived by an ancestor of the house. The eldest branch of the family, that from which the poet's father sprung, was settled at Bergamo.

“Bernardo Tasso, though he had more than a full share of the hereditary capacity for literature, for business, and for war, by no means participated in the hereditary prosperity of his relatives; and the ill fortune which attended him, settled more heavily on his son Torquato. He was left an orphan very young by the death of his father Gabriel, with the burden of two little sisters, Laura and Bordelisia.”—i. 18.

After various changes of fortune, in the year 1531 he was appointed his chief secretary, by Ferrante Sanseverino, Prince of Salerno, the first nobleman in the kingdom of Naples, celebrated for his magnanimity and valour, no less than for his patronage of literature and the arts. In his service Bernardo remained for three-and-twenty years, enjoying his regard and esteem with scarcely any interruption. For many years this connexion proved a source of happiness and prosperity to him, which he shared with a beautiful wife, to whom he was tenderly attached. At length, however, one of those reverses so common at that period—and still so common in every land where the strong hand of tyranny has not altogether destroyed the spirit of those whom it desires to crush,—befel this excellent and patriotic noble, and Bernardo

was driven into exile in company with his patron. His son Torquato joined him, whilst yet a child, and the wandering life which he was compelled to lead must have tended greatly to increase that restlessness of disposition which caused him, in after life, so much suffering. But we are forestalling.

It was in one of the loveliest spots of the loveliest region of the earth, that the earliest years of the future poet were spent.

"Sorrento is situated in the Bay of Naples, to the south-west of that city, at the base of that spur of the Appennines which projects between the Gulfs of Naples and Salerno. 'It is so pleasant and delightful,' says Bernardo, 'that the poets feigned it to be the dwelling of the Sirens. This allegory alone would demonstrate its beauty. Its delights, however, are not those which entangle the mind in vice and luxury, but such as tend to the health and pleasure of mind and body together.' 'A most sweet abode is it,' says Manso, 'especially for the Muses; for the verdure of the leaves, the shade of the trees, the continual fanning of soft airs, the freshness of the clear waters which spring in the retiring valleys and hanging hills, the fertility of the opening plains, the serenity of the sky, the tranquillity of the sea, where the fishes, and the birds, and the savoury fruits, appear to rival one another in abundance and variety, when thus appealing in one harmony to the eye and to the mind, frame indeed a great and marvellous garden, such as poets have assigned to Falerina, Alcina, or Armida. A narrow plain spreads out towards the north, rich and fruitful to a proverb, containing corn-fields and vineyards, interspersed with stately clumps of pines and other trees. The mountain of Santa Agata shuts this round, sloping rapidly in one part down to the very walls. The town itself, besides a cluster of houses round the cathedral, is chiefly a succession of villas, running along the bay, on steep, precipitous rocks of considerable height. The edifices are bosomed in groves of myrtles and oranges, where the perfume of the flowers and the songs of the nightingales are said to be sweeter than any where else in Italy. Chesnut and ilex woods rise behind, clothing the bases and sides of the mountainous amphitheatre with dense and deep foliage. Streams sparkle here and there through the shade, some gliding in the valleys, some tumbling down the hills; the former appearing as if lingering amid the charms of the fair land, the latter as if hastening towards the lovely sea, which reflects the impending cliff in its deep sheltered calm. Hollowed along their base are natural grottoes and baths, true caves of the nymphs, some square and some round, and some paved with red, some with yellow, others with silver sand, but all translucent and sparkling, and contrasting marvelously with the deep blue waters outside.

"Amongst these villas, and overhanging the bay, next to the Church of San Francesco, still stands the house of Tasso. For here Bernardo, as he tells us, 'recalled to his studies, his mind, which had so long been wandering on from one affair to another, as a bird from branch to branch;' and here, on the eve of St. Gregory, the 11th of

March, A.D. 1544, when the sun was in its highest meridian, Torquato was born."—Vol. i. pp. 28—31.

It was indeed a fitting cradle for the genius of a poet, especially of such a poet as Tasso, in whose writings, as in a mirror, we may trace the hues and forms of his native land. Truly, an Italian has not half the credit in being a poet, which of right belongs to the children of less fortunate climes. He must have something not merely unpoetical but absolutely antipoetical in his nature, who is not warmed into inspiration by the glories of a southern sky and all that it covers. There is no wonder that France has no poets—she would have had them in plenty had the Counts of Thoulouse gained the ascendancy instead of their northern rivals. The wonder is when a man like Crabbe starts up a poet, in such a county as Suffolk. He must have had a superabundance of the celestial fire, who could feel his soul kindle amongst uninteresting flats, vast forests of turnips, lifeless streams, and mighty flocks, not of Heliconian swans, but East Anglian geese; and perhaps the want of charm with which this truly great poet is frequently charged, and not always unjustly, may arise in some measure from those early influences through which even a Homer or a Shakspeare could not have passed scatheless.

At any rate, our opinion will scarcely be called in question when we refer the exquisite grace and rich loveliness, it is a bold expression but a just one, so conspicuous in the writings of Tasso, not only to the natural gifts of the poet however great, nor to his industry however unwearied, but also in some degree to the effect of that scenery in which his earlier years were spent.

It is rather the habit of the day to speak slightly of the "Jerusalem" and its author, and the celebrated saying of Boileau, who rebukes those that prefer—

"Le clinquant du Tasse à tout l'or de Virgile,"

has passed almost into a proverb. And yet if we examine the question fairly, we shall find many grounds for admiring the poet of the Crusaders, and not a few for depreciating the exaggerated praise bestowed on the earlier Italian bard. Whatever be the comparative merits of the two minstrels, and we are not about to discuss them at present; to neither of them can be accorded that degree, or even that kind of praise which belongs to the author of the first—the only epic. The two Italians are first-rate second-class poets; but it is a mere puerility to claim any thing higher for either of them. And yet what exquisite pleasure are their works, or certain portions of them, calculated to confer on those who are capable of appreciating them. Take up the "Jerusalem" and read a page at random any where, and you

cannot avoid being charmed with the melody of the numbers, the richness of the diction, the exquisite grace and delicacy and elegance of the thought and the expression. Nor are these the only merits of Tasso: he has the fire and the sublimity of the poet, as well as the skill and taste of the artist; and if, as is perhaps the case, he has injured his renown by bending his genius too strictly and too constantly to his art; it is a fault which now-a-days is of so rare occurrence, that we could almost admire him for it, when we witness the unwarrantable carelessness and insufferable presumption, which is so often evinced by those who deem themselves the gifted children of song.

Tasso then lived as a child at Sorrento, Salerno, and Naples, giving wonderful promises of his future renown, such as every nurse records concerning her own foster children, though they are not preserved, except when their after fulfilment makes them more interesting as well as credible.

“During these fruitless expeditions of his father,” (says Mr. Milman after describing Bernardo’s wanderings,) “Torquato had been fulfilling in his childhood the marvellous promises of his infancy. After his mother had brought him to Naples, his education was superintended by his tutor Don Angeluzzo, under whom, when he was six years old, he had already mastered the rudiments of Latin. At this time the Jesuits, whose society had lately been established by Paul III., after much debate and hesitation, opened at Naples, as was their custom every where, a small church with schools for different classes of children attached to it, in a street near the Palazzo de’ Gambacorti, and therefore convenient for young Tasso’s attendance. For young children their system was admirably adapted, however narrow and mind-repressing afterwards. Under their tuition Torquato’s progress was astonishing. His ardour and diligence were almost incredible. He never let the day surprise him in bed. Often he rose up while it was yet deep night. His mother had even to provide torches for him, that he might arrive at the very early hour when the fathers commenced instruction. He began his attendance at this school A.D. 1551, directly after it was opened. During the three years that he remained in it he became a good Latin scholar, made some proficiency in Greek, and acquired such readiness in speaking and writing, both in prose and verse, that at ten years old he publicly recited some of his compositions to the amazement of those who heard him. Here also, by his mother’s watchfulness, and the care of his teachers, his mind seems to have been imbued with that strong religious tone, which, though choked for a season under the temptations of youth, and ambition, and the love of glory, still never, as it appears, was altogether fruitless, and which afterwards, under God’s blessing, became his support in the overwhelming afflictions through which he passed, was his one stay in the restlessness and despondency which those afflictions naturally left behind, and being purified, and if we may dare

say so, perfected through suffering, brought him repose and quiet at his end, and a happy departure after his many miseries. Writing, many years afterwards, to Jacopo Buoncompagno, General of the Church, to ask for his intercession with the Duke of Ferrara, in his letter from the hospital of Santa Anna, he recalls the first communion to which he was taken by his teachers, and describes it as having made an ineffaceable impression upon his mind. He was, he tells us, at the time scarcely nine years old in reality, but so forward, both in body and mind, as to be equal to a boy of twelve or thirteen. Without fully understanding the mystery, he yet participated, he assures us, with the deepest devotion and joy; 'and remembering,' he adds, 'my sensations at the time, I now feel confident, that I then received into this earthly body of mine the Son of God, who deigned to show in me the marvels of his working, because He beheld me receive them, *i. e.* the elements, into a dwelling-place, yet uncontaminated, simple, and pure.'"—Vol. i. pp. 58—61.

This deep sense of religion is one of the most striking and interesting features in the character and history of Tasso. The biographies of really great poets have not, alas! often this attraction. It is, indeed, painful to think how generally men have abused the highest and holiest gifts of their Maker—how little has been given to the service of God, and how much to that of the devil—how few of the sons of song have left behind them any proof that their souls were blessed with Christian faith, their spirits cheered by Christian hope, or their bosoms warmed with Christian love. In Tasso, however, despite the errors of his youth, and the sorrows of his manhood, we see the blessed leaven working on till it at length leavens the whole lump.

And now Bernardo being unable to reunite himself to his wife and children, and finding his loneliness insupportable, determined that Torquato, at least, should join him at Rome, with his tutor Don Angeluzzo. After dismissing her young son with much affection and regret, Porzia, such was the name of Bernardo's wife, retired with her daughter into a convent. The mother and son never met again—but in after years the sister gave refuge to her brother, when fleeing from his merciless persecutors. Arrived at Rome, Torquato recommenced his studies with the same diligence which had before characterized him, and which he retained throughout all his wanderings and all his woes.

The following anecdote is very characteristic. The circumstance took place whilst Bernardo and his son were at Rome:—

"Provoked at last by the dealings of the Pope with the King of France, Philip II., who had succeeded his father, Charles, on the throne of Spain, reluctantly commanded the Duke of Alva to advance from the Neapolitan dominions against Rome. He forthwith occupied the greater part of the papal territories, south of the city, and spread his

forces over the Campagna, so that his light horse made inroads up to the very gates. . . . With that adventurous spirit, which was reckoned, as we have noticed, hereditary in the Tassi, young Torquato, at the age of twelve years and a half, hearing that a Giambatista Manso was left in command of the army during some absence of the Duke of Alva, and imagining him to be his godfather, an advocate of the same name, resolved to seek an interview with him, with a notion, perhaps, of inquiring about his property. He stole away by himself, and in secret. As he approached Anagni, the head-quarters of the Spanish troops, he met a squadron of their cavalry, under the Marquis of Santa Agata, who, struck by his youth, beauty, and courage, brought him, at his request, to Manso. Torquato immediately perceived his mistake, and was alarmed when he saw a stranger, and remembered his participation in his father's condemnation. The warriors, however, only admired his spirit, and avowing their old friendship for his unfortunate parent, conducted him back to the neighbourhood of the city."—Vol. i. pp. 70—72.

We can bestow short space upon the period which intervened between Torquato's departure from Rome and his arrival at Ferrara, the scene of his glory and his grief. In that interval he had laboured incessantly at his studies. At seventeen he had entered the university of Padua, and attempted, according to his father's earnest wish, to study for the law. At the end, nevertheless, of the first year, he produced an epic poem, "the Rinaldo." The hero is the famous paladin, cousin of Orlando, so well known to the readers of Boiardo and Ariosto. His love and marriage with Clarice, daughter of Ivon, king of Gascony, and the adventures through which he passes in achieving this object, are the theme of the poem. "There is much polish and elegance in his verse: the stanzas in 'ottava rima' are sonorous and well rounded. . . . It may justify the assertion of Menage, quoted by Serassi, that as the Odyssey is called by Longinus the production of age, but of the age of Homer, so the "Rinaldo" is the production of youth, but that youth, Tasso's."

The college life of Tasso is strikingly portrayed, and gives us an interesting picture of that life as it then existed in the Italian universities. Of the many distinguished men who resorted to Padua,

"Some were public lecturers. Some were private teachers. Others had no definite appointment, but opened their apartments to all industrious scholars, where the subjects of their studies were discussed with much freedom, and both masters and disciples met and contested with one another the palm of wit and eloquence. The distinguished citizens joined in these assemblies, or gave entertainments themselves, where the same discussions were renewed. The students also were of all

classes, and yet mingled in these reunions on terms of equality and liberty. Opinions were started, passages or sentences from ancient or modern authors, new discoveries in science or art, compositions in prose and verse, were submitted to the criticisms of the assembled company. The most celebrated champions undertook opposite sides in the arguments. Poems were read, canto after canto, or stanza after stanza, as they were written; improvements in the past, suggestions for the future, were freely offered, attentively discussed, and thankfully received.

“The lecturers and professors, as of old in Athens, in gardens of Academus or the Stoic porch, and afterwards in early Christian times, when the Basils and Gregories resorted to that city, contested, with the keenest rivalry and jealousy, who should attract the most numerous and most renowned disciples. If the antagonist parties met in the streets, they could not refrain from open and violent disputes; sometimes they came to blows; daggers even were drawn, and blood shed.” —Vol. i. pp. 93—95.

One of these quarrels induced Tasso to migrate to Bologna. Here he was received with open arms, and commenced writing his “Jerusalem;” but being injuriously treated, on the charge of having written a squib—a charge totally devoid of proof—he returned once more to Padua. It would have been well for him had he remained there and followed a purely literary career; it would have been better still had he adopted the course which his father pointed out—that of the law. But the imagination of the young poet was dazzled by the fatal splendour of the courtier life, and he at length succeeded in attaching himself to the Cardinal Luigi d’Este—fatal success. Alas! how often does Heaven grant us the object of our passionate desire, not in love, but in anger; or, if not in anger, in that stern love which would teach us by experience the folly as well as the sin of attempting to struggle with the wise decrees of an all-merciful Providence.

“Torquato therefore, full of youthful hope, and an ardent thirst for distinction—his vivid imagination glowing with the brightest day-dreams—bade a tender farewell to his college companions and friends, especially his beloved host, Scipio Gonzaga, and departed amidst the general regret of the whole university; and, revisiting first his father at Mantua, where he fell ill, but speedily recovered, arrived towards the end of October, A.D. 1565, at the court of Ferrara, ordained to be the scene of his unrivalled success, and then of his unrivalled oppression and affliction.

“Tasso was twenty years of age when he reached Ferrara, but appeared older than he really was. He was very tall, of strong and active frame, of stately carriage, a little short-sighted, and with a slight hesitation in his speech, but of that grave and melancholy beauty which is said to be most attractive in men. He excelled in all warlike and knightly exercises. He had mastered all the learning of the times, and

though somewhat addicted to taciturnity and gloominess, and occasionally very absent, could, when he pleased, throw the greatest brilliancy and charm, both of manner and eloquence, over his carriage and conversation in society. Add noble birth, a name already blazoned over the whole of Italy, the highest reputation for honour as well as genius at that early age, and the expectation of a yet more glorious future, and such a character stands before us as could scarcely fail of attracting the favour and affection of his patrons, and all the distinguished personages of the Ferrarese court, and of awakening dangerous envy and jealousy in the hearts of those courtiers whom he eclipsed, and perhaps more dangerous attachment in the breast of those of the other sex, into whose intimate society he was thrown."—Vol. i. pp. 117—120.

Alfonso II., son of Ercole II., by Renée of France, was at this time Duke of Ferrara. Having privately made away with his first wife, Lucrezia de Medici, he was now about to espouse Barbara, Archduchess of Austria. The account which Mr. Milman gives of the preparations for this bridal, and the pageants which accompanied it, is very graphic and vivid. Leonora was prevented from joining in these festivities by indisposition, and Tasso's first introduction was therefore to her sister Lucrezia, afterwards Princess of Urbino, who always retained a sincere friendship for him:—

"On Leonora's recovery, Tasso was introduced to her. He had admired her portrait before; and now, as he testifies in one of his most celebrated canzoni, 'On this, the first day, that the beauteous serene of her countenance met his eyes, and he beheld love walk there, if reverence and wonder had not turned his heart into stone, he would have perished with a double death!'"

It has been disputed whether Tasso really loved the princess as a man, or merely admired her as a poet. And, again, whether, supposing him to have really loved her, his passion was returned. To us the question admits of no doubt whatever. Tasso did love Leonora with all the deep intensity of his powerful and sensitive heart, and the princess not only returned his passion, but perhaps gave only too strong proofs of her attachment. It was the discovery of this secret, though carefully concealed by Tasso, which instigated Alfonso to pursue that diabolical system of vengeance by which he well-nigh produced the madness of which he accused his victim. It was the strength of this passion which recalled Tasso into the power of his relentless enemy when he had regained his liberty. It was the reciprocation of this attachment which brought Leonora to the grave, whilst her lover was wasting away in a madhouse. It was the undying recollection of this love, together with a consciousness of guilt, which rendered Tasso so anxious, up to the very last, to obtain the forgiveness of Alfonso.

Alas ! that such things should be ! that the noblest of earthly feelings should become the source of sorrow and the occasion of sin.

It is strange, now, in looking back at the picture which lies before us, to consider how the relative position of the parties in the drama is changed. Tasso, though noble amongst the noble by his high and ancient lineage, and the great qualities which frequently seen in his ancestors were eclipsed by his own, was at an immeasurable distance from Leonora d'Este.

And now ! her very name only lives in that of her admirer. The proud and vindictive Alfonso would have been long ago forgotten but for his inspired victim. Time has vindicated the intrinsic superiority of the homeless wanderer. The mighty of his day, whether friends or foes, are now but his attendants. Nature, inverted by the living, has exerted her prerogatives over the dead.

For a time Tasso's brightest hopes were realized in the court of Ferrara. All was *couleur de rose*. The duke honoured him, the princesses made him their constant companion, and whilst proceeding with his greater works, especially his "Jerusalem," he found time to exercise his skill in composing a variety of smaller poems upon every event connected with either the princesses or the court. The number of these sonnets and canzoni, and their ease and appropriateness, appear almost incredible. Indeed his tongue was never silent, his pen never still ; and until his brilliant success called forth the jealousy of his associates he was universally popular.

We will not follow him through the various scenes of fame and splendour now spread in his path, nor accompany him in his journey to France, and the various excursions which he made after his return to Italy. It was now that he obtained the object of his anxious wishes, an appointment in the court and service of the Duke of Ferrara. The absence of the duke in the early part of 1573, on a visit to Rome, giving him more than ordinary leisure, he finished in two months his long-meditated "Aminta," universally considered the perfection of the pastoral drama ; and each month as it rolled by saw the "Jerusalem" advancing nearer and nearer towards completion. The labour which he bestowed on his great work, the eagerness with which he sought, and the humility with which he adopted the corrections and suggestions of the literati of his time seems almost beyond belief. The anxiety with which the whole literary world awaited the appearance of the great poem is something which we can scarcely comprehend. The day however of his prosperity was drawing rapidly to a close—fear and doubt and suspicion gathered around him—warnings were given and unheeded—advice proffered and disregarded—he

felt himself suspected, but he would not fly—the walls of his prison-house were slowly but surely closing around him—every day his enemies became more numerous, more powerful, and more anxious for his destruction, and he read his fate in the altered look and manner, and tone of voice of his patron. During one of his excursions his room had been ransacked, his locks broken open, his papers examined and seized. And whilst every day showed darker signs of the gathering tempest, powerful princes vied with each other in soliciting his presence at their courts. But warnings, advice, danger, ambition were all in vain; the ill-fated poet felt a viewless chain which bound him to the court of Alfonso; he would not, he could not leave the presence of Leonora.

We pass over the change in Alfonso's conduct, the machinations of Tasso's rivals; his dread of the Inquisition, that terrible tribunal which was frequently used as an instrument of secular as well as religious tyranny; his fears of poison and assassination; his suspicions almost amounting to certainty, that the proud and jealous and malignant and unscrupulous d'Este had discovered the secret; the arts by which the duke endeavoured to entangle him; the steps which led to his ruin, and avail ourselves of the language in which Mr. Milman has described the awful consummation:—

“There is a room in Venice containing a curious and fearful collection. There are the rack, the horse, the boot, the wheel, the cord, the strangling chair, arm-screws and thumb-screws, and many other contrivances for stretching or compressing, dislocating or crushing, the poor human body and its several members. There are other more ingenious, and almost more terrible, because more treacherous instruments; boxes, and vessels, and bottles, once full of strange and subtle, rapid or slow poisons; scent-boxes from which leaped a knife to gash the fair cheek, or split the beautiful nostrils, or otherwise mutilate the lovely face, as it bent over them to inhale the perfume; jewel-cases, from which some long, sharp needle should start, or some pungent mixture, or detonating powder should be suddenly cast to extinguish the bright eye, hastening to inspect her wedding ornaments, or her lover's offering; necklaces which should contract round the white neck; bracelets which should run into the snowy arm; helmets, breastplates, gauntlets, secret pistols which should perform the same offices to the warriors of the age; implements of dreadful ingenuity, which conjure up dark scenes of horrible cruelty and subtle remorseless vengeance, not to speak of other guilt, too often acted in that time and country.

“Amidst these ingenious, but abominable treasures of tyranny, whether royal, oligarchical, or democratical, I doubt if Alfonso could have selected a more subtle and tremendous instrument of torture and revenge, than that which he chose for the punishment of Tasso. He

resolved to accuse him of madness ; to wring from him first, if possible, an acknowledgment of his offence, and, if that failed, a confession of madness ; thus saving his honour in all points, he would have him at his mercy, to deal with him as he pleased. He appears, however, first of all to have done all he could to drive him really out of his senses.

“ Long harassing insults and vexations, amidst simulated kindness ; alarms about his poem, first lest it should be published without his knowledge, then lest it should be burned ; delays and excuses in granting him justice upon the assassins who attacked him ; attempts to set him at enmity with his best friends ; interception of correspondence ; corruption of all his servants ; violent entry into his rooms, false keys forged for his desks ; investigation of papers, so ruinous if known ; dim threats of the dreadful accusation of heresy, and fears of the Inquisition ; rumours of danger to his person or his life, hints that the fatal knowledge had been gained ; all these were employed to work upon his mind—if we add a dependant condition ; love which could not be uttered ; the irresolution produced by the contest between terror and affection, between his attachment and the exhortation of his friends ; a high spirit, a frank and confiding, but melancholy disposition, liable to occasional fits of abstraction, though hitherto always esteemed, even remarkably courteous and grave ; a vivid imagination, a great dislike of solitude, an eager, even inordinate desire of renown ; if we thus put together the means employed to work on Tasso's mind, and the character of the mind on which they were exerted, it would not be very wonderful if they had succeeded, certainly they were well adapted to their object. Still nothing has hitherto transpired ; Tasso seems restored to favour ; the duke has spoken kindly ; he finds that he cannot drive Tasso into any open transgression ; he seems inclined to disappoint his enemies, to advance him in his favour. All of a sudden the blow falls !

“ One evening, in the chambers and presence of the Duchess of Urbino, Tasso is arrested by the duke's order on a strange charge of having seized and raised a knife against one of his attendants, in a fit of frenzy. Not a word, not a suspicion of madness had been whispered before, but now it is given out that Tasso is a maniac ; and, under the pretence of preventing further mischief, Alfonso commands, with many expressions of compassion, that he shall be shut up for the moment in some rooms looking on the court-yard of the palace.”
—Vol. i. pp. 255—260.

Hence he obtained a partial release in answer to his earnest entreaties, being allowed to return to his own apartments under the strictest surveillance. Soon however he had to undergo a still severer trial, for the duke desired that he would accompany him to his country palace of Belguardo ; and—

“ There in the gorgeous apartments, or the pleasant gardens, where he had so often read and sung, and feasted with the great and gay, and with the objects of his admiration and affection, Tasso was submitted to a kind of moral torture. ‘ With rough harshness, and with unwonted

arts and acts and words (they are his own expressions), Alfonso endeavoured to 'wring from him some reason of anger against him.' What threats, what promises, what crafty hints, what enticements and persecutions the duke employed, the marble walls and sculptured pillars, or the flowing waters and waving groves were alone conscious. We may imagine him now kind, now furious, now stern, now smiling, now solemnly recounting his favours, and Tasso's ingratitude, now making light of the business, and smiling to entrap him into some unwary acknowledgment ;

"Now he might speak as if he knew nothing, now as if he knew all that occurred, now he might invite confession as a friend, now command it as a sovereign. When his 'unwonted arts' failed, he might grow more open in his displeasure : he might alarm him with renewed fears of the Inquisition, or the rack, or death ; now he might assail him by suggestions of punishment impending over the object of his attachment. When Tasso continued resolute in his silence, he might inform him of, perhaps show him, the condemning papers, the wanton verses, and demand with angry sarcasms for whom they were intended. Whatsoever the mental torture was, to which Tasso was submitted for more than a week, we must conclude that it could not overcome his determination to make no revelation.

"Then the grievous sentence was past on him, that he must be a madman for the rest of his days. This declaration also he was required to confirm, by his own acknowledgment of its truth, and by his subsequent conduct, and by submitting to the confinement necessary for such unfortunates, and to the medical treatment calculated for their recovery.

"When this racking examination was concluded, still with words of simulated friendship and pity, Alfonso gave directions that Tasso should be carried back to Ferrara, and confined in the convent of St. Francesco, with two friars to keep watch on him continually ; and 'because' (said the Duke's missive) 'he is used to utter every thing in confession, and to break out into a mountain of frenzies, so that he is far worse than ever, the superior is to choose for his keepers, persons fit to admonish him of his madness.' Tasso was shut up according to these orders, and at first exclaimed that he would become himself a monk ; a not unusual way in that age of escaping the merciless persecutions of the powerful. This, however, was not the duke's aim. His mind seems to have been made up. Tasso was to be a maniac. Accordingly, as such, he was committed to the convent."—vol. i. pp. 263—266.

He contrived, however, soon to make his escape from this confinement, and arrived safely at the house of his sister Lucrezia, who dwelt at Sorrento. Here he passed in calm seclusion some of the happiest days of his life. The respite was, however, but of short duration. Like the storm-tossed sailor, who reaches some lovely island under a southern sky, and, after sharing its delights for a brief season, leaves them, perhaps for ever, to buffet once

more with wind and wave, Torquato, heedless of the destruction that yawned upon him, resigned the sweet peace of his sister's home for the court of Ferrara. *A letter from Leonora recalled him*, and he departed, "thinking it more noble to put his life into the duke's hands than to deny Leonora's wishes."

"A few words of formal courtesy were at first vouchsafed to him, but in a day or two his persecutions recommenced. Studied insults were offered him by the courtiers. No apartments were provided for him, nor any means of subsistence assigned to him. His papers were detained by some man of rank, who refused him their possession in terms of contempt. He applied to the duke, but could obtain no answer. He was forbidden to speak to him. He supplicated in dumb show. He used signs and gestures of entreaty and submission, and was answered only with signs and gestures of scorn. Explanations, even words, were refused to him.

"He turned to the princesses; he could not win a reply. Soon the doors were shut in his face, with every mark of insolence, even by the grooms and porters of the palace."—Vol. i. pp. 177, 178.

Once more he fled, and, after meeting with many strange adventures and much unkindness, reached Turin, where he was treated with the greatest hospitality, courtesy, and respect. Yet, though cherished, courted, honoured by the sovereign and his attendants, by princes, nobles, and people, he still feels the power of the irresistible attraction: he still finds it impossible to live but in Ferrara: he still prefers every danger in the neighbourhood of Leonora to every delight in separation from her; and, though urged by his host to remain, and warned by his friends to desist, the attraction is too strong, the impulse too powerful, and he returns to one of the darkest dooms that ever was the lot of man.

He chose for the season of his return to Ferrara that of Alfonso's nuptials with his third wife, Margherita Gonzaga, daughter of the Duke of Mantua. On his arrival he found himself treated with as cruel neglect, as insolent inhumanity as before. And the entry of the bride brought him neither consolation nor relief.

"The revel, the feast, the tourney, the harmonious concert, the magnificent spectacle, the gorgeous pageant, fill the city, as at Tasso's first coming, with melody and splendour. But Tasso, deceived, insulted, trampled on, scoffed at as mad, wandered to and fro alone, houseless, disconsolate, and trembling, amid the glittering tumult, groaning and repenting that he had ever left Turin, where he was so kindly and honourably treated. The studied impertinences and insults of the courtiers and servants were renewed with greater licence than ever.

I shunned, or mocked, or reviled him. None comforted, none altered him.

“Not one of the promises made to him were fulfilled. Every thing as done, which subtlety or malignity could devise, to irritate him. or a month he bore the brunt of this miserable persecution, and restled hard against this cold torrent of contumely. Worn out at last with the continual struggle, stung to the quick in his tenderest point, his reputation, and provoked by some more cruel insult than usual, his patience exhausted, and his indignation aroused, he broke out into vehement reproaches against the duke and his court, lamenting his long thankless service, retracting the praises which he had poured upon them, and complaining of the treachery and false promises which had beguiled him. His words were carefully conveyed to the duke.

“The long sought opportunity was come. Without delay Tasso is apprehended by Alfonso's order, though with many expressions of concern and pity, calculated to enforce the impression of his madness which the duke had so long laboured to establish. He is declared a confirmed maniac, and as such, committed to the hospital of Santa Anna, an establishment for patients, and especially for lunatics, of the lowest class of society. In a wretched cell of this building, solitary, helpless, destitute, with the threatening voices of the keepers, the hissing of the lash, the clanking of chains, with the shrieks of the frantic, the gibbering laughter of idiots, the yells and howls of maniacs, ringing continually in his ears, and reminding him without ceasing that he had become one of them, Tasso lay for many days overwhelmed and stupefied. He aroused himself, he looked around, he began to discern and comprehend his misery. But he awakened at the same time to exert himself.”—Vol. i. pp. 306—308.

“He had loved renown, society, the sweet face of nature, the praise of men, the affection of women. He had been delicate in his food, particular in his dress, fastidious in his person. He had a dread, we have seen, as many imaginative persons have, of confinement, of scorn, of solitude. The cell in which he was shut up, was narrow, and dim, and unfurnished. There was no prospect from it. His only objects of view were the blank, damp walls around him, and ‘the gate shut ever in his face.’

“No one at first was admitted to visit him. He was never allowed to move forth, even to the holy rites of religion. Of the physicians for body and soul, so often spoken of before, nothing was now heard. The sad, terrible sounds of a madhouse were continually breaking in upon him. Person, dress, food, were now disordered and foul. The chaplain of the hospital was not permitted to attend him. The prior, a man otherwise of high character, and a friend of Ariosto, we must conclude by the direction of higher authorities, treated him with the greatest inhumanity. The rough attendants of such an asylum behaved to him with insolence and contumely; even more fearful treatment seems to have been dealt out to him, so grievous, that he who published Tasso's account, has left blanks in the worst particulars.”—Vol. i. pp. 317, 318.

“ He had, however, writing materials. And surely by a very great exertion of courage, and with a resolution and energy, wonderful in such circumstances, he was able to use them, and, at times, very diligently. Even in that cell, that gloom and solitude, surrounded and harassed by the fearful noises of his abode, under that awful impending apprehension of never coming forth any more, he commands himself to write such poetry as has not often been surpassed or equalled, to frame supplications in prose and verse to persecutors and friends, scholars and prelates, princes and princesses, emperors and imperial counsellors; to compose philosophical dialogues of the most regular and elaborate nature.”—Vol. i. pp. 320, 321.

But even this was not all. The seclusion of a prison, the tortures of a madhouse were not the only afflictions of the ill-fated one. It seemed as if on his doomed head were to be showered all the evils which it was capable of receiving. For whilst he was thus immured in base, and miserable, and, as it seemed, hopeless captivity, two fresh calamities befel him. The Princess Leonora, who had sickened from the moment of his incarceration, grew worse and worse, till at length, after an illness of several months' duration, she expired. And the “*Jerusalem*,” by which he had hoped to command both fame and competence, was piratically published, and then scurrilously attacked. But enough of the madhouse, and its tale of woe; for all further particulars of his trials and consolations there we must refer to the ample materials contained in the volumes before us. We cannot however leave this painful subject without paying a just tribute of praise to the poet Guarini. The rival of Tasso in the time of his liberty, he endeavoured to serve him in every possible manner during his captivity; he joined in the various attempts made to liberate him; he published Tasso's works under his direction, he did every thing that he could to advance his interest and alleviate his distress.

And now at length the continual applications made to Alfonso on Tasso's behalf produced their effect, and the vindictive d'Este permitted the Duke of Mantua to take him to his court. But freedom came too late for earthly happiness to be its result; Tasso had become restless, fearful, melancholy, and he wandered from one end of Italy to another, now caressed, and now cruelly neglected, till at length he was discovered by his cousin Alexander, in a public hospital at Bergamo, founded by his own family, in which he had taken refuge to avoid the necessity of begging in the streets.

The contrasts exhibited in this period of his eventful life are as striking as we can well conceive. We see him in one city honoured by the highest nobles, in another denied admittance by the menials of his oldest friends; at one time resting in the

ospitable seclusion of a monastery, at another domesticated at the lordly castle of some passionate admirer. During this period it was that he performed the pilgrimage to Loretto which he had vowed in his captivity.

"The city was full of inns and hostelries, and as was usual with places of pilgrimage, was rather noted for its noise and immorality; for often the votaries, after the appointed penitences and ceremonies were fulfilled, made up for the self-denial and toil of the journey by indulgence in all kinds of gaiety and revelling. It was in general a strange scene of mingled solemnity and frivolity, devotion and dissipation.

"Tasso, however, was sincere in his penitence, and thoroughly in earnest in his pilgrimage. Fearful as it is to perceive how much the Blessed Virgin is regarded, even by such a man, as the object of confidence, the fountain of grace, the great trust and consolation of the afflicted, it is impossible to help feeling the deep resolution and seriousness with which he implores her all-powerful intercession, and the devotedness and reality with which he henceforth consecrates his energies and life to the service of religion. Neither in him do we perceive what is too often discernible as an accompaniment of the former opinion, that awful view of the Saviour as only a severe and terrible Judge, who must not be approached or appealed to directly, and to soften whose rigorous and unbending justice, the soft prayers and tears, not to say commands, of the Virgin Mother are needed. In other verses, and other writings of his life, he turns his gaze, and pours out his soul, whither the Scriptures and the early Church direct our whole trust. With apparently the most fervent contrition, faith, and love, he seeks the mediation, and cleaves to the atonement of Him who took our nature into His, that He might fulfil those offices toward us, and that we might be able, and have confidence to come unto Himself. One hopes that this faith will be accepted, and for it the other misbelief forgiven."—Vol. ii. pp. 156—158.

The narrative of this portion of Tasso's life, together with the incidental descriptions of men, and manners, and scenery, will amply repay a careful perusal. The episode concerning the holy house of Loretto is excellently told. But we shall pass over these interesting subjects untouched, and proceed to the conclusion.

The tide of Tasso's fortunes was at length decidedly turning. At Naples, success of every kind attended him, and thence, summoned apparently by the new pope, Clement VIII., he started for Rome, the great robber-chief, Marco Sciarra, withdrew his victorious bands to give him free passage, and he reached the imperial city in safety. It was here that he had suffered, perhaps more than any where else, since his liberation, neglect, poverty, insult; but now, all was changed.

"He was received into the house of the Aldobrandini, the pope's nephews, on conditions most agreeable to his disposition, that he should

be exempt from all attendance and service, and have full leisure for philosophy and poetry."—Vol. ii. p. 242.

"I know not," says Mr. Milman, "if any dwelling in hall, bower, or palace, in the stateliest and most famous cities, is so adapted to poetical imaginings, as the woods and the hills, 'where inspiration breathes around.' If any such is to be found it certainly would be an apartment in the Vatican. . . . Here he dwelt favoured by the pope himself, honoured and beloved by his two nephews, especially the Cardinal Cintio, who admitted him freely and fully to all the honours of their society and table. All the 'sacred college' vied in showing him attention. The nobles and princes of Rome, the Gaetani, Orsini, Colonnas, the haughtiest barons in existence, were equally anxious to entertain him. The prelates immediately attached to the court befriended him in every way. The scholars and authors among them, sought eagerly the privilege of his society and conversation."—Vol. ii. pp. 248—250.

His health, however, rendered feeble by all that he had gone through, was gradually declining; and in the summer months he retired once more to Naples with the consent of the Aldobrandini. Here he employed himself in his "*Mondo Creato*," and various other works; and in his lawsuit with the Prince of Avellino, who had obtained unjust possession of his mother's fortune. Hence he was recalled to Rome, which he seems well-nigh to have forgotten, by the pope and the senate, who, at the instance of Cardinal Cintio, resolved to grant him "a triumph, and the laurel crown in the Capitol, the highest reward of poetic merit, and of which Tasso, in previous days, had professed some desire."

"He was conscious of his approaching dissolution, and declared to Manso, before he departed, that although he went by his advice, he yet felt sure that he should not be in time to receive that honour, his coronation, namely, which he persuaded him to seek. Then, having embraced his friend with much tenderness, as if never expecting to see him any more, he started about the first of November. . . . At some little distance from the gates of Rome he was met by the household of the two cardinal nephews, and by a great part of the pope's own suite, and by many prelates, and ministers, and noblemen, and conducted by them in grand state as if in prelude to his intended triumph to the Vatican palace, where he was immediately admitted to salute Cintio and Pietro. . . . The following morning he was solemnly introduced into the pope's presence, who received him most kindly and graciously, and after many commendations of his virtue and merit, said to him, 'We have destined for you the laurel crown, that it may henceforth remain as much honoured by your wearing it, as it has heretofore conferred honour on those who have worn it.'

"Tasso kissed the pope's feet according to custom, and returned thanks with much humility for his kind expressions, and for the honour

proposed ; showing, however, no symptoms of pride or of gladness at the announcement, as if ever foreseeing his approaching decease, and at last freed from the 'fatal garment,' which had so long cleft to him, the love of the vain distinctions of the world.

"A continuance of stormy weather prevented the immediate execution of the ceremony. Tasso made all the delays he could, and it was put off till the spring should offer a bright day and clear sunshine, to adorn and illuminate the arrangements.

"Meanwhile the city was resounding with preparations. The Vatican, whence the procession was to start, the streets through which it was to pass, the Capitol, where the pope was to set the crown with his own hand upon the poet's forehead, were all to be magnificently adorned for the occasion. Prelates, princes, nobles, professors, and students were thronging from all quarters into the city to witness the triumph. All the bards of Italy were inditing pæans for the occasion with universal emulation. But there was no glow on the pallid, calm cheek of the poet."—Vol. ii. pp. 264, 265.

We would gladly transcribe the next chapter, the last, *in extenso*. The matter is so very striking, the manner so very appropriate, the different parts form such an harmonious whole, that we sincerely regret our inability to do so. The opening, describing Tasso's oak, the view from the garden of the Hieronomite monastery of St. Onofrio, and the thoughts which the place and scene naturally call up, is as eloquent and beautiful a piece of writing as any with which we are acquainted, and forms a fine prelude to the sad burden of the remainder—the death of Tasso :—

"It was a haunt," says Mr. Milman, speaking of St. Onofrio, "suited to the decline of life, the glow of whose sunset rested now upon Tasso ; for the tide of his fortunes seemed now to be changing ; all things began to wear with him an aspect of prosperity. Honours and renown seemed exhausting themselves for his advancement. Those deemed highest and greatest upon earth vied in doing him reverence. Independence also and comfort, so long vainly yearned for, were on the point of pouring in upon him. The pope assigned him a regular pension of 200 scudi. The Prince of Avellino agreed to pay him an annuity of 200 ducats, and a considerable sum at once, in addition : thus raising him immediately to competence and ease. The papal nephews and the whole court were anxious to show him every possible kindness. . . . He was only in his fifty-second year, when all things looked thus smilingly upon him ; and now the month of April, A.D. 1595, the time of his coronation, was just come, and all things were in readiness for its splendid celebration.

"At this moment his prophetic forebodings were fulfilled. He had eaten some sweetcakes or macaroons, which had been presented to him on his journey from Naples, and had felt sickly, and in pain, ever afterwards. And now his illness increased upon him. He perceived that his days were numbered, and his end imminent."—Vol. ii. pp. 273—275.

The Cardinal Cintio, to whom he applied for leave to depart, immediately granted him permission to do so, and conveyed him in his own carriage to the convent of St. Onofrio, the spot which he had chosen. The rain was falling heavily as the fathers saw the princely vehicle toil up the steep ascent which led to their gates, and at once divining that no common event could bring it there under such circumstances, they hastened forth to meet it. They received their guest with the utmost tenderness of affection, and shed tears when he told them that he was come to die among them. "They conducted him to one of their best apartments, and used every possible means to restore and revive him, and every possible argument to encourage him. His illness, however, was beyond the reach of medicine, and his expectation of death firm and continual." He wrote at this time a most touching and edifying letter to his friend Costantini, and showed every sign of fervent and genuine piety:—

"On the 10th of April he grew worse; fever ensued; and the physicians began to despair of his recovery. The tidings spread over the city, and diffused an universal gloom. On the seventh day of the fever Cesalpini, the pope's physician, and an old friend of Tasso's, announced to him that there was no chance of his recovery. Tasso embraced him with a tranquil countenance, and thanked him with fervour for the announcement; and then immediately raising his eyes, and keeping them fixed on heaven, with yet greater earnestness and affection, he gave humble thanks to the merciful God, who was pleased at last, after so many and violent tempests, to bring him thus to the desired harbour. . . . From the hour of that announcement of his death, and that heavenward thanksgiving, to translate Manso's words, 'he spoke no more of any thing relating to this life, or to his fame after death, but turning altogether toward heavenly glories, thought of nothing save preparing himself for that high eternal flight which he hoped soon to make. . . . And disburdening himself of every worldly weight by the strength of holy Sacraments, which he would receive in the Church below his apartments, where he had himself carried the morning following his death-stroke, in despite of his weakness. He there received the penitential absolution from the hands of the priest, and afterward the holy host from the altar. He was carried back to his bed in the arms of the brethren.'—Vol. ii. pp. 277—280.

He then, at the suggestion of the prior, made his will; and, at his especial request, directed that his body should be buried in the church of the convent. It is a relic far more precious as well as genuine than many of those preserved on the European continent, whether we consider the literary renown or the Christian sanctity of the distinguished guest. His writings he left to Cintio; a

small picture of himself to Manso, his faithful generous friend; and a silver crucifix, the gift of Clement VIII., to the convent.—

“Then Torquato,” says Mr. Milman, still quoting the words of Manso, “all intent on the perilous journey he was about to undertake, lay the seven following days, that is, till the fourteenth day of his attack, continually communing with his Saviour; and so abstracted from earthly things, and so sensible of heavenly things, that all the bystanders, of whom there were many every day, felt consolation and compunction together. This was especially the case with his confessor, who, after his death, declared to many friends, that for many years before his death, he had never discovered in him any trace of deadly sin.

“When he had reached the fourteenth day of his illness, and the last but one of his life, feeling himself growing weaker every hour, and perceiving that he was on the point of dissolution, he desired to strengthen himself once more with the Viaticum of the holiest body of our Lord Jesus Christ. As he was unable to rise from his bed, it was brought to him by the prior. On his entering the room, he, beholding it, cried out with a loud voice, ‘Expectans Expectavi Dominum;’ and then, devoutly receiving it, united himself with Him, with such affection and humility, that the company present, as they looked wondering on, could not help seeing in his manner an earnest of future blessedness. . . . In the meanwhile, Cardinal Cintio, informed by the physicians that Torquato had only a few hours of life remaining, proceeded toward him, and conveyed him in the name of the pope his solemn benediction, which is in general only bestowed in such a way, on cardinals, or people of the highest importance. . . . After this, (*i.e.* the cardinal’s departure,) no one was admitted except his confessor, and some fathers of approved learning and sanctity, who sang psalms alternately one with another, Torquato joining in at times, as far as his failing breath allowed. So he remained all the night, and till noon the following day, the 25th of April, St. Mark the Evangelist’s feast,—when, feeling himself giving way altogether,—with his crucifix closely embraced, he began to chant the words, ‘In manus tuas Domine’ (Into Thy hands, O Lord); but not having sufficient strength to finish the verse, he ended the short but glorious career of his mortal life, to enter, as we ought to hope, on the other immortal career of eternal glory in the heavenly Jerusalem.”—Vol. ii. pp. 282—287.

As we have been unable to transcribe the whole account of Tasso’s death, as it is given by Milman from Manso, we have, for the most part, selected such portions as exhibit that religion which was essential to him as a sincere Christian, rather than those which illustrate that superstition which was incidental to him as a devout Romanist. Such descriptions have their lessons, if we would learn them aright; they bring before us painfully the errors of our fallen sister, and show how, for the most part, those errors darken

the mind of the holiest of her children ; and yet, at the same time, they prove that even in the midst of errors, when faith is keen and love is true, the Father of love vouchsafes to take to Himself, and clothe with His blessing, those who seek Him earnestly and humbly.

But there is one scene more—

“ The honours which had been lost to him in his life were paid to him after his death. . . . The body, . . . was arrayed in a splendid gown, the laurel which had been prepared was wreathed round the head, and thus laid on a stately bier. Tasso was borne, from the monastery where he died, through the Borgo, and the piazza of St. Peter's, and back to the church of St. Onofrio, with a grand display of candles, followed by a great number of various monastic brethren, by all the courtiers of the papal palace, by the household of the two cardinal nephews, by the professors of theology and philosophy, and by a crowd of nobles and scholars. All thronged to see for the last time, the man who had conferred such distinction on the age, and who concentrated on himself so many different kinds of renown. Painters and sculptors trode upon each other, in their anxiety to catch a clear impression of the celebrated lineaments, which had attracted such high affections, and been wasted and withered by such unrivalled affliction, in order to commit them to the canvas or the marble with as much accuracy as possible.”—Vol. ii. pp. 288, 289.

Having thus traced, though briefly, the career of Tasso from his cradle to his grave, we cannot conclude this article more appropriately, and we trust more usefully, than by the paragraph with which Mr. Milman concludes his life.

“ When he was asked by some young Sorrentines what was most needful for students, he replied, ‘ Perseverance ;’—and what next ?—‘ Perseverance !’—and what in the third place ?—‘ Perseverance !’—His own rule, it is much like Cicero's, seems to have carried him not only to the summit of literary renown, but to have formed in him the grace of constancy, which afterwards, as he said in Santa Anna, was ‘ his one only rock of refuge.’ And this, indeed, is one great use of early application, too often overlooked, that it forms the habits of resolution, energy, and constancy, not for study only, but for higher uses. Only let it be blessed with that, which, his biographer tells us, was the light of Tasso's later years, continual meditation on the incarnation and passion of the Saviour, the contemplation of His cross, and the charity which flows from it. These will sanctify and settle upon a sure foundation that fortitude, which, without them, is in truth but stubbornness, and must shatter itself at last against the decrees of God. These will transform it into the image of His infinite patience, on whose Atoning Sacrifice it rests.”

ART. VI. — *Œdipus, King of Thebes; translated from the "Œdipus Tyrannus" of Sophocles, by Sir FRANCIS HASTINGS DOYLE.* J. H. Parker, 377, Strand.

THE translator of Greek tragedy has, assuredly, no light task. His resources for acting on the minds of his public are out of all proportion less than those which were at the command of the Greek poet. He undertakes to convey to the solitary and indifferent modern reader by mere written words, and through the veil of a foreign language, the effect of dramatic works which were produced under a concentration of favouring circumstances such as the world has never again seen. The drama of the Athenians was delivered in the spoken words of a most beautiful language, aided by all the appliances of the scenic art, in a vast theatre, under the bright sun of Greece, open to all the exhilarating influences of nature; above all, before an audience who combined a correct taste with a high enthusiasm, to whom these performances were at once their most valued enjoyment, and an important religious duty, and who saw in them the highest development of their national life.

That such a concourse of favouring circumstances should have stimulated genius to the noblest efforts, is what might be naturally expected, and the high excellence of the Greek drama has been proclaimed by the critics of all ages and countries. Yet it can hardly be thought that the modern reader, even when he is capable of reading the Greek drama in the original, should peruse these works with the same feelings with which they were at first beheld. It ought not to surprise us if we feel some little disappointment in the perusal of works produced under circumstances so widely different, if we cannot always sympathize with the enthusiasm of the ancients for poems so inadequately presented to us. And if this is apt to be the case even with the scholar, how difficult must be the task of the translator, who has to make his author felt through all the difficulties which attend the attempt to render ancient ideas in modern language. But whatever may be the difficulties of presenting the Greek drama in an English dress, they have not been sufficient to deter translators, at least, from the tragedies of the writer with whom we are most particu-

larly concerned, Sophocles. Of his tragedies there are three translations in English verse, those of Franklin, Potter, and Dale. The first author, who dedicated his work to George the Third when Prince of Wales, tells us that Sophocles "seems purposely to have waited for the present happy opportunity of making his first appearance among us, under the patronage of his Royal Highness;" "a circumstance" which, he is of opinion, must make Sophocles an ample recompense for the neglect with which he was till then regarded. However fortunate Sophocles may have been in his patron, he can hardly be said to have been very much so in his translator, which he would perhaps have thought of at least equal importance. Franklin has little regard for exactness, and still less poetical vigour; he writes like a man who thought more of his patron than of his subject; he shows little anxiety to do justice to his author, and little power to do so, had he entertained such a feeling.

Potter is, indeed, far superior to Franklin; his versification is grave and dignified, and his powers far more on a level with the subject. Yet he seems to have written with little enthusiasm for his task, and to have been little penetrated with the spirit of antiquity; he is, on the whole, flat and heavy, and, in the most trying parts, the choruses, he allows himself great licence in paring and clipping whatever was difficult to handle.

Dale, who tells us that he was "invited and encouraged by a highly respectable list of subscribers," assigns, as the principal motive of his translation, that he desired "to render the diversified metres of the original by measures as nearly corresponding as the genius of our language will permit." Yet his version is much better than might be expected from so odd an introduction; it is regular, correct, and accurate, and if it does not rise high, neither does it fall very low. But he is cold and tame, and shows little poetical taste or vigour.

Nor indeed could any very favourable result be reasonably expected from the translators of that school. The taste of the eighteenth century, however exact it may have been, was certainly very narrow. The age which could accept the brilliant *mis-translation* of Pope as a version of the *Iliad* of Homer, which abused the genius of Dryden in the attempt to cut down Shakespeare; and in which Johnson, in his great collection of English poetry, left out Spenser and Chaucer to insert Blackmore and Pomfret, can little pretend to any but the most contracted and conventional views of poetry. In truth, during the prevalence among us of what may be called the French taste, every thing which did not fall in with the preconceived notions of the critics, formed upon a very slight knowledge of the ancients, and a much more

accurate one of their French imitators, was thought to be hopelessly barbarous. In our own time criticism has acquired a more healthy tone; the principles and rules of taste have been enlarged, and the circle of our literary pleasures is become wider. We are not now satisfied with a translation which does not truly represent the sense and spirit of the original.

But this the translator cannot convey to the reader, unless the latter is prepared to judge of the work before him by other rules than those to which, by the perusal of modern works, he has become habituated.

We must expect much in the works of antiquity which does not chime in with our ideas, and while we enjoy that inheritance which the great men of old have left for foreign nations and for other ages, if we persist in judging them by our preconceived notions of taste, we shall hardly escape some feelings of disappointment, perhaps even of disgust.

The thoughts and feelings of the Greeks were not as ours, and half the value of their great works, a most important part of the history of the human mind, would be lost, did we try to force them into an unnatural congruity with our own conventional ideas and feelings. In truth, the ancients and the moderns look upon the drama from very different points of view, and try its merits by very different tests.

We value dramatic poetry chiefly for its expression of human passions, and if this be done in a poetical manner, our highest standard of excellence is attained. But with the Greeks it was far otherwise. Their drama was part of their national worship, and this was assuredly no mere hypocritical fiction, but really felt and acted upon by the most serious and religious part of the community. When in the inevitable decline of the primitive state of feelings in Athens, Euripides made human passions predominant in his tragedies, it was regarded as a serious offence against propriety by those who desired to uphold the old manners. Strange as it may appear to our notions, the Greek tragedies were, and were intended to be, *sermons*. The poets were the preachers of the ancients¹. It has been often remarked how close was the connexion between the poetry and religion of the Greeks, and doubtless there were poets not altogether unworthy of their high calling, who had a real reverence for a deity, however imperfectly known, and a sincere desire to benefit their fellow-men. The religion of the early Greeks, while it enforced much of morality, by no means enjoined either a pure or a perfect code of duties, its

¹ It might, perhaps, be said, that Sophocles and Pindar were orthodox preachers; *Æschylus*, an heretical; and *Euripides*, a free-thinking one.

chief basis was terror, the dread of unknown powers greater than man, whose will was revealed only to the initiated, and its great aim was to procure their favour or to propitiate their wrath by mysterious ceremonies. And the early tragedy, as a part of religious worship, was intended to strengthen and deepen these feelings, and to impress on the people the necessity of the accustomed rites, and the danger of neglecting to give due honour to the gods. The aim and tendency of Greek tragedy was to subdue the mind by striking it with a sense of the instability of all human things, and of the irresistible force of "that unknown combination of infinite power which men call fortune;" and thus, by the exhibition of terrible catastrophes, to show forth the might of the gods and the nothingness of man. Nor was this lesson without its value, strange and confused as were the notions of the ancients with respect to the character of their gods and the moral relations of actions, they were surely far better than a cold insensibility to the one, or a presumptuous denial of the other. It was quite in accordance with these feelings that Aristotle should lay so great, and, as it seems to us, so disproportionate a stress upon the plot of a tragedy. It was the "*περίπτεσις*," the revolution in human affairs, which was to make manifest the power of the gods; and it was by the completeness of this that the effect of the tragedy was measured.

And we shall find this character strongly marked in the two great dramatists Æschylus and Sophocles, who represent the ideal of the Athenian tragedy, for Euripides, as we have seen, belongs to another school.

Of the seven plays of Æschylus which have come down to us, in one, "The Prometheus," the personages are altogether supernatural. In the trilogy of "Agamemnon," the characters act under the directions, or by the inspiration, of divinities whether good or evil; and in the "Furies," these deities are themselves the chief actors. In the "Suppliants," the interest turns upon an important point of the national religion. In the "Seven against Thebes," the gods interfere to punish the impious vaunts of the besiegers. In the "Persians," alone, the actors and the action are purely human, and even in this we find the ghost of Darius, while the whole play was no doubt understood to be an offering of thanksgiving to the gods who had delivered Greece.

Of the seven remaining plays of Sophocles nearly the same may be said. The hero of the "Trachiniæ" is a god; in the "Ajax" and "Philoctetes" the gods interfere in person; the subject of the "Electra," the expiation of the murder of Agamemnon, is the same with that of one play of the Æschylean trilogy, and of the trilogy of Sophocles; the two others, besides the one now under consideration,

are most intimately connected with the Greek worship. The subject of the "Œdipus at Colonus" is the purification of Œdipus from the guilt of his involuntary crimes, and of the "Antigone," the due performance of the funeral rites of the heroine's brother, which were thought necessary to ensure the repose of his soul. Hence the rigid severity, and, to modern taste, the nakedness and hardness of the early Greek drama, both in construction and ornament. The human element was kept strictly subordinate, the will of the gods was to be the main spring of the plot; little of the variety, which arises from the play of human passions, was allowed; and even poetical ornaments were sparingly used, except in the choruses, which were often direct hymns to gods. Too much decoration would have been inconsistent with the main object of the writer—to subdue the mind by the terrors of the unseen world. And this severity the audience might well endure, for they were fascinated by superstitious fear, and during the action of a tragedy, their minds filled with the horror of the coming calamity, were little at leisure to attend to mere idle ornament—

" They heard the wheels of an avenging god
Groan heavily along the distant road."

In the "Antigone" of Sophocles the heroine, though actually betrothed to Hæmon, while she bewails the terrible fate to which she is doomed, is allowed to make no allusion whatever to her lover. She laments, indeed, that she is to die without marriage, and without offspring, for to desire them was a part of the religious feelings of the ancient world; but any intrusion of merely personal feelings would have seemed to the poet to detract from the purity of her martyrdom.

The theory of Schlegel, that the subject of Greek tragedy is the struggle of the human will against destiny, is little borne out by the facts. It would, in truth, be much more applicable to the Homeric poems, in which far more play is allowed to the passions and will of man; who is often represented as contending with the gods themselves. In the early tragedy (of which only we are speaking), men are little more than passive instruments in the hands of the divinities. In the most terrible passage of Æschylus, Clytemnestra exclaims that she has indeed slain the King of Mycene, but that she is not now the wife of Agamemnon, but the avenging fiend of the house of Tantalus. In the same play Cassandra, prescient of approaching death, rushes into the slaughter-house, driven by the impulse of the god who has doomed her to destruction. This is not to represent the struggle of the human will against destiny as the main spring of the action, but rather to annihilate it altogether. In truth, the Homeric poems

treated the old legends in a poetical and romantic, the tragedies in a religious and sacerdotal sense; the tendency of the former is to inspire and fortify the mind; of the latter, to terrify and subdue it. It is the difference between enthusiasm and superstition.

With the Greeks, as afterwards in Christendom, the drama sprang from religious ceremonies; the worship of Bacchus produced the first, as the mystery plays of the middle ages did the second. But the Greek drama rose up at once to its full stature; its character was stamped at first. Our own grew by degrees, and its great works were composed when the religious element was no longer predominant. Hence the type and tendencies of the two are altogether different. And this may be seen most easily where the Greek and English tragedians have to traverse common ground; where their subjects are very similar, their mode of treatment is yet entirely distinct.

The situations of Clytemnestra and of Lady Macbeth have much in common; in both the leading feature is a fierce and resolute daring, an intensity of passion and crime, which tramples on all the charities and duties of life, which is deaf to every suggestion of fear or pity. But, in the work of the English dramatist, we are called on to admire or to detest the strength of the human will, and the perverseness of the human heart; we are admitted to the workings of human passions, and we behold their punishment in the obscure visitings of nightly remorse. Nothing of this came within the plan of the Greek tragedian; there is no preparation of the mind, no self-hardening of the heart of Clytemnestra for the deed of death that she is to do. The invocation of Lady Macbeth to the mysterious powers of nature to close up in her "the access and passage of remorse," has, in the Greek murderess, been already accomplished by the dark agencies of evil which pursue the accursed house of Atreus. She is possessed by a fury, and she moves on to her purpose with the remorseless and undeviating energy of some senseless engine. We have heard the characters contrasted to the disadvantage of Æschylus, but with little reason. Each poet chooses those sources of effect which are most proper to the end which he has in view; he strikes at his audience where they are most sensitive; and while Shakspeare far surpasses his predecessor in skill and variety, his subject could not admit of his attaining the terrible grandeur of conception in which Æschylus has surpassed all men. And the same differences will be found on comparing Hamlet with those Greek tragedies which embrace a subject of the same nature. The situation of Hamlet is the same as that of Orestes—both are supernaturally commissioned to avenge great crimes upon their

nearest relatives—but how different is the treatment of this common theme. In “Hamlet,” the chief interest is concentrated upon the mind and character of Hamlet himself. In the cruel position in which he is placed, the poet has been careful to bestow on him that precise character and frame of mind which is most adapted to afford the dramatic effects of opposing passions, and to throw light on the pathology of the human heart, by exhibiting it in so strange and trying a situation. Hence the ultra-philosophic, reflective, and vacillating character of Hamlet. Having to express the struggle of man against circumstances which overpower him, the poet has chosen that character in which the internal conflict of the human will against an irresistible destiny is most strongly manifested. No other character would have exhibited with equal force and propriety the workings of the human heart under the pressure of inextricable difficulties, which form the proper subject of the play.

Both Æschylus and Sophocles, in their extant works, have treated the retributive slaughter of Clytemnestra, but in neither does Orestes possess any character or excite any interest. The struggles of the heart and conscience in his dreadful position, which seem so natural and obvious a dramatic topic, appear to be little thought of, and he slays his mother without reluctance or remorse; for he is the inspired avenger of blood, the mere instrument of the Divine justice; and though he is afterwards to suffer terrible punishment for his violation of the ties of blood, he cannot be supposed to resist for one moment the inexorable will of the gods.

Both in “Macbeth” and “Hamlet” the machinery of the plot is set in motion by supernatural agency, but in neither does it exclude the free workings of the human spirit. The witches in “Macbeth,” the ghost in “Hamlet,” act by and through the human personages; they incite indeed, but do not compel; the free will of man is not annihilated. Macbeth is tempted, indeed, by the powers of darkness, but is under no necessity to yield to their unholy suggestions; and Hamlet long questions and doubts whether he shall obey the admonitions of his father’s spirit. We have already seen how differently the supernatural element is treated in the Greek tragedy,—how it absorbs the human will, and becomes the main spring of the whole drama.

So far did this view of the subject lead the dramatists, that even the most natural feelings of the heart are personified into divinities. The natural remorse of Orestes is embodied in the furies who pursue the slayer of his mother; and he is tormented, not by his own thoughts, but by the personal interference of those mysterious goddesses.

It is sufficiently evident that such a school of poetry could not endure very long. As knowledge and science advanced, the old religion fell into discredit; pious men were scandalized at the strange and immoral actions which the poets attributed to the gods; the sceptics laughed more or less openly at the whole popular system; the blind and unreasoning faith of a primitive people was to be found no where. All the extravagancies of the old legends, no longer softened by the mists of early and inveterate prejudice, became glaringly obvious. The audience began to look out for improbabilities, and to demand variety. The poet thought more of himself, and less of his subject. In the tragedies of Euripides we may clearly discover this downward tendency. Euripides may be said to have made the Muse of Tragedy descend from her buskin, as Æschylus to have mounted her upon it. He gave much more room than his predecessors for the play of human passions, and was esteemed the most tragic, that is, the most pathetic of the tragedians. Feeling the want of variety in the old tragedy, he no longer confined his choruses to the subject of the action. They became odes, in which any subject might be introduced in the most arbitrary manner. On the other hand, it is sufficiently evident, from the jokes of Aristophanes, that he was reproached by his contemporaries with having lowered the tone of tragedy by the undignified costume and language with which he delighted to represent his heroes; and his immoral sentiments and free-thinking subtleties were frequent subjects of blame. And in truth, the attempt to treat the wild legends of early times in a sceptical or rationalising spirit, could hardly be very successful. The incongruity between the subject and the mode of handling it, could scarcely be got over by any ingenuity; and it seems to have been a nearly universal tradition among the Greek critics, that the ideal of tragedy was to be found in Sophocles.

It may not be impossible to trace in the criticism of Aristotle the conflict of two very different schools of dramatic art. On the whole, he decidedly prefers the school of Sophocles to that of Euripides. He professes to regard the tragedy which we are now examining as a model of excellence. He is of opinion that the Chorus ought to form one of the persons of the drama, and he exacts an ideal excellence of character from the personages of tragedy which clearly is inconsistent with the exigencies of what we may call the natural school. On the other hand, he is evidently offended by the improbability of the legends from which the tragedies were framed. Such stories, he says, ought not to be put upon the stage at all. The licence of improbable fiction which may be indulged to the epic, cannot be allowed to

the dramatic poet. The celebrated sentence, "that the office and end of tragedy is to purify the passions by pity and terror," belongs to an age of quite different feelings from those out of which the early tragedy arose. The doctrine that tragedy was to teach had survived the teaching. But in truth the philosopher, if his meaning was that tragedy should give a didactic instruction in morals, demanded of dramatic art, what it was altogether unable to give, except by the entire sacrifice of its peculiar characteristics.

To the taste of the sceptical Horace, the direct and personal interference of the deities, so common in the old tragedy, no doubt appeared strangely incongruous and unsuitable; and we may easily trace in his advice, that the gods should only appear on extraordinary occasions; a lurking feeling that it would be better to dispense with their presence altogether, and keep them entirely out of the action.

Still less was such a school of poetry susceptible of being imitated by other nations, and in other languages. It is indeed very remarkable, in the history of letters, that such frequent and obstinate attempts should have been made to imitate the Greek tragedy, when it is in truth, of all the great works of antiquity, that which least admits of a successful imitation. The feelings which gave life and warmth and vigour to the old dramatists, were necessarily wanting to their modern successors. Those grim old legends were strangely unsuited to an audience who, instead of accepting them with a pious awe, were on the watch for incidents to criticise, and were offended at improbabilities. The French dramatists were altogether unable to treat the Greek subjects with the simplicity which properly belonged to them; and they conceived it absolutely necessary to introduce a pair of lovers to utter the cold exaggerations of the conventional passion of their stage. Even Racine, when he took for his subject the sacrifice of Iphigenia, has perverted the story in the strangest manner, by sacrificing another princess in the place of Iphigenia; and is afraid to have recourse to the miraculous substitution of a hind for the princess, lest it should seem too improbable. Yet surely in dealing with the legendary traditions of ancient Greece, a greater or less amount of improbability in the supernatural machinery, where almost every thing is supernatural, can be of little moment.

Nor was the form of the ancient tragedy, so tenaciously retained, favourable to the development of the modern. The simplicity of construction which confined the action of the piece nearly to one point of time, though it allowed space for the catastrophe of the Greek tragedy, could hardly give room enough for the greater

variety of action and of sentiment of a modern play. The workings of the human heart, the development of human character, can seldom be adequately exhibited within such narrow limits. Straightened by the limits of their subject, the French and Italian tragedians have sought refuge in impertinent love scenes, or in frigid and interminable declarations. A French critic says, with much justice, "nos pièces en cinq actes, dénuées de chœurs, ne peuvent être conduites jusqu'au dernier acte sans des secours étrangers au sujet."

The strong sense and masculine taste of Alfieri rejected the exaggerated sentimentality of the French school; but the difficulties of the subject were too great; he was driven to take refuge in the dreary deserts of declamation, where it requires no small patience to follow him.

It is not, perhaps, too much to say, that it was the severe self-restraint, which a rigid and religious view of their art imposed upon the early Greek tragedians, that gave rise to that chastened tone of feeling, and that rigid abstinence from unnecessary ornament, which so strongly marks what we call the classical school of literature. Nor was this voluntary rejection of beauty without its compensation; as in the early and religious styles of the imitative arts, whether in Egypt, Greece, or Italy, art may well have gained as much in dignity and intensity of expression, as it lost in variety. The tree that is trained and clipped, may bear a finer fruit than that which grows in the wild luxuriance of nature. The hard and stiff forms of early art, often affect the mind more forcibly than a more lively and natural manner could do, and the serenity of repose is no less congenial and salutary to the human mind than the search for novelty. Coleridge tells us that in his youth, of the Greek tragedians, he most admired Æschylus; as a man, Euripides; but in his old age, Sophocles.

Of all the Greek tragedians, it is Sophocles who the oftenest appeals to the sentiments, and enforces the duties of the national religion; and this tendency is peculiarly prominent in the play before us.

The plan is very simple, and the incidents few. But fairly to understand it—to enter into the feelings and motives of the personages, we must again request the reader to carry back his thoughts over three-and-twenty centuries, and to endeavour, as far as may be, to look at the play in the light in which it was originally intended to be viewed.

It was one of the most deeply-rooted religious feelings of antiquity, derived perhaps in part from the traditions of an older and purer faith, that homicide polluted the land where it had taken place; the blood of the slain was held to cry out from the

ground, and to call aloud for vengeance. These evil consequences might be averted, and the anger of the spirits of the dead appeased by proper sacrifices and expiations which were directed by the priests or the oracles; but where they were neglected, the elements were thought to be cursed—the blood-stained earth refused her increase—the air was tainted with death—the cattle perished, and the land became a prey to famine and pestilence².

The unexpiated slaughter of Laius has afflicted Thebes with disease and death; and an embassy, headed by Creon, has been sent to Delphi, to consult the oracle on the causes and cure of these calamities. The play opens as the Chorus headed by the High Priest comes to supplicate Œdipus to assist in discovering the source of their calamities; at this moment Creon returns, and declares the response of the oracle, that the slayer of Laius must be either put to death or exiled. The Chorus sing a hymn to Apollo, and Œdipus solemnly imprecates a curse on the unknown regicide; he is to be excommunicated, deprived of fire and water, and thrust forth from the society of his fellow-men.

As the oracle has not declared who the slayer of Laius is, the aged and blind Tiresias is sent for, and interrogated by Œdipus. He at first refuses to answer; but when the king charges him as an accomplice in the deed, he loses temper, "*genus irritabile vatum*," and declares that the regicide is the monarch himself. Œdipus breaks out into fury, asserting that the accusation has been forged by the prophet and Creon; and even the Chorus hint their doubts as to the accuracy of the oracle.

An altercation between Œdipus and Creon ensues, and brings out Jocasta, who laughs at all prophets and prophesyings; but in doing so she explains to Œdipus, what he is strangely enough supposed never to have yet heard, the circumstances of the death of Laius. Œdipus begins to fear that he is himself the devoted author of the fatal deed. There is but one survivor of the slaughter, a herdsman, and he is sent for. The Chorus utter a train of general moral and pious sentiments, and the result seems to be doubtful.

But the catastrophe is imminent; a messenger now arrives from Corinth, with the news that Polybus, the supposed father of Œdipus, is dead. The oracle had foretold that Œdipus should kill his father, and Œdipus and Jocasta exult over the futility of divination. In the alienation of her mind, Jocasta encourages

² The salutary and harmonizing influences of such an opinion are sufficiently manifest: it might well be wished that such a superstition could become popular in Tipperary.

Œdipus in the terrible line,

“ Yet what a light breaks from thy father's tomb³ ! ”

The interest is now wound up to the highest point, and the catastrophe comes down at once like an avalanche. The messenger explains to Œdipus that he is not the son of Polybus, but was given to him by the herdsman of Laius, with his feet pierced. The dreadful truth now glares before the eyes of Jocasta. It is very characteristic of the spirit of the old Greek tragedy, that she is kept on the stage to hear this tremendous revelation, uttering no word or exclamation ; mute, as if thunderstruck with the tidings of Divine wrath.

The herdsman is the man who has been already sent for as the survivor of the attendants of Laius. Jocasta attempts in broken sentences to hinder his coming ; she fails, and departs to hang herself, the mode of suicide commonly attributed to the ancient heroines. The herdsman is brought in, is forced to answer by threats of torture ; he reveals the whole truth, and Œdipus, declaring himself unworthy to see the light, rushes off to put out his eyes. A magnificent chorus bewails the instability of human things. The action of the play ends here, but it is prolonged by a description of the manner in which Œdipus puts out his eyes, with which Corneille is very reasonably disgusted ; by the lamentations of Œdipus, than which silence were better ; by a scene certainly of great pathos, in which he bewails the fate of his daughters, and by another altercation between him and Creon, of which the author seems to have been more fond than was necessary⁴.

The faults of the plot are obvious, and have been often remarked. Nothing can well be more absurd, than that Œdipus should not know the reason of his own name, or that he should have gone into exile, because ignorant of what it seems every one else knew, that Polybus was not his father, except perhaps that he should reign for many years at Thebes, and be unacquainted with the manner of his predecessor's death. But the dramatic interest is wrought up and sustained with extraordinary skill and energy ; the plot is evolved, and the situations constructed with great care and wonderful power, and the catastrophe comes down at last with terrible weight and force. Above all, with reference to its main end, to uphold the religion of the times, the play is worked out with wonderful skill. It enforces throughout that favourite topic of the ancient moralists, the instability of human affairs, and

³ It would be mere pusillanimity in a reviewer not to observe that this line is far finer in the English than in the original.

⁴ Some snarling scholiast has said, from the frequency of scenes of this kind in Sophocles, that that tragedian must have kept a dog to assist him in writing his tragedies.

that moral which it so naturally suggests, that "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." The poet carefully contrasts the overbearing conduct and language of Œdipus, the levity of Jocasta, and the presumptuous incredulity which both exhibited towards the oracle, with the terrible calamities into which they are so soon plunged. The very message that lulls Œdipus into fancied security, by the intelligence that his supposed father is dead at Corinth, causes the revelation of the tremendous truth.

The footsteps of advancing destiny seem to sound like the tread of the statue in the awful music of Mozart, audible to all but the victim; the thunder-cloud of Divine wrath hangs low over the head of the devoted Œdipus; the thunder growls, but his ears are charmed and he cannot hear it; he sees the fatal truth only by the flash of the thunderbolt that strikes him helpless and blasted to the earth. The oracles and their fulfilment are the main spring of the action; the catastrophe is foretold by one oracle, it is brought about by another, which directs that the slayer of Laius shall be sought out and punished; and it is aggravated by the obstinacy of Œdipus, who rejects the advice of the prophet Tiresias. And to estimate the effects of this on the audience, we must reflect that these things were by them believed to be true in the main; that they thought them to be true accounts of real persons, and that the oracles were still revered as the divinely-inspired guides and directors of human life, the instructors of kings and nations.

And even that which most shocks modern feelings, that the terrible misfortunes of Œdipus should be undeserved, helps to point the main moral, that the ways of the deity are unsearchable and past finding out; and that there is no security for man, not even in a clear conscience, against the worst of human calamities.

The fame of the tragedy of Œdipus has attracted many imitators; the story has been given by the poet who passes under the name of Seneca; and it has been presented both to a French and an English audience, under the great names of Corneille and Dryden. Yet neither of the great modern poets has achieved any success in the attempt; their rivalry with the Athenian has only betrayed their inferiority; and their attempts to improve upon their original, have only served to make their failure more conspicuous. As might be supposed, the imitations all depart more or less from the simplicity of the original. Seneca has ornamented the play with the ghost of Laius, who is evoked by the foul and cruel rites of a vulgar necromancy, a profanation to which the spirit of a god-descended hero would never have been exposed in the age of Sophocles.

The subject of the play has afforded ample scope for those cold atrocities in which that author, with the taste of a true Roman, seems to have delighted, while the perpetual succession of unnatural conceits contrasts most unfavourably with the dignified simplicity of the Greek original.

Corneille, who appears to have valued himself not a little upon his alterations of this play, and who tells us that no other of his tragedies is composed with equal art, has invented what he is pleased to call "l'heureux épisode" of the loves of Theseus and Dirce, who ring the changes upon all the variations of the conventional gallantry of the French romantic drama, and, in fact, throw *Œdipus* himself very much into the shade. Dryden (who was assisted by Lee in his *Œdipus*), while he has severely blamed Corneille for his episode, and has expressed so high an opinion of the Greek author, that he even assures the audience in his prologue, that if they do not approve his tragedy they must be content to be universally stigmatized as barbarians, has by no means made his practice conformable to his precepts; and the tragedy which he has presented to his English hearers bears little resemblance to that of Sophocles. He has made, indeed, a much stranger medley than Corneille. For while he has suppressed Theseus and Dirce, he has invented an Adrastus and Eurydice, who are altogether as extravagant as their predecessors. He calls up the ghost of Laius with invocations which are evidently borrowed from the witches in "Macbeth." He has converted Creon into a feeble imitation of Richard the Third; while the play ends with a general massacre, which sweeps away all the principal personages, and leaves hardly enough to bury the dead.

But the calamities of *Œdipus* were not yet terminated. About the year 1820, a *production* on the subject of *Œdipus* was placed in the hands of a "Mr. J. Saville Faucit," author of the "Lazar's Grave," "Scripture Concurrence," "Justice," "The Miller's Maid," &c. This production was the occasion of an operation "which it is but justice to add was very unwillingly *undertook*," and which, after the space of ten days, had for its result, "*Œdipus, a Musical Drama; compiled, selected, and adapted from the translations from the Greek of Sophocles, by Dryden, Lee, Corneille, and J. Maurice, Esq.*" The drama in question is, for the most part, taken from Dryden's play; but in spite of the short period allowed for its composition, the author found time to adorn it with some most curious and original ornaments. *Œdipus* enters upon the stage, like Marlowe's Tamerlane, in a triumphal car, drawn by captured Argives, with which people he has been at war. *Œdipus* suddenly bethinks himself of inquiring into the cause of the quarrel,

and asks Adrastus, the vanquished sovereign, "Why were we foes?" "'Cause we were kings," replies Adrastus; and upon this very satisfactory explanation, they are struck with a vehement admiration of each other's virtues, swear eternal friendship; and Œdipus having successfully driven into Thebes, and having apparently no further occasion for the services of his draft Argives, suddenly promotes Adrastus from his post as near wheeler, to the more pleasant and less laborious one of his son-in-law, by giving him the hand of his daughter Eurydice. This wonderful performance is announced in the dedication as an attempt to revive the Greek Drama! We sincerely hope that the attempt will not be renewed, and that the much-vexed ghost of Œdipus may be at length suffered to rest in peace, and be no more raised up to minister to the unhallowed purposes of modern playwrights.

To the tragedy before us the voice of antiquity has always assigned the highest rank. Sophocles has been commonly regarded as the most perfect of the Greek tragedians, and this has been generally esteemed as his greatest work. Aristotle, in the treatise which goes under the name of the "Poetics," appears to consider it as almost a model tragedy; and though he bases this judgment upon very narrow and technical grounds, we may feel sure that he would never have hazarded so decided an opinion, had not the play been conceived and executed in a tone of thought altogether suitable to the feelings of antiquity. It was pitched in the right key for the audience to whom it was addressed. And yet to our feelings it seems strangely dry and hard, exhibiting little character or play of passion,—improbable in its story, odious in its plot, and shocking in its catastrophe.

It is evident that in such a work the modern reader must at first find much to disappoint him; he misses much that he is accustomed to look for, and many of the sources of interest which it contains are to him shut up. It is only by some attention and thought, that he will attain to a full conception of the dignity and austere beauty which pervades and informs the whole.

And yet there are few greater services which can be rendered to literature in our own time, than to make such poetry acceptable to us. The study of the severe models of antiquity is, above all things, adapted to correct the false taste, the love of glare and glitter, the vagueness of purpose, the looseness of expression, and the idle or false sentimentality which have so much overrun the literature of the present age. But in proportion as the object is desirable, it is difficult; and the more such a work is useful, the less is it likely to meet favour. It requires some courage, as well as much skill to present to an English public the Greek tragedy

as the Greeks made it; and to introduce to an audience of this fantastical century the Attic Muse in the native simplicity of her country's costume—

“Great is the glory, for the strife is hard.”

And this Sir Francis Doyle has dared to do; he has given us a real translation of his author, not, as has been too much the fashion in dealing with the classics (however sanctioned by the great names of Pope and Dryden), another poem upon the same subject. While his original poems show sufficiently that he wants neither power of invention nor facility of expression, he has, with a most praiseworthy abstinence, refrained from introducing any thing of his own; he has scrupulously left his original as he found it. It is in truth hard to say, whether it is more difficult to find an idea of the original which has been left unexpressed in the translation, or a new one which has been introduced without warrant. The difficulty of so representing an ancient author, under all the exigencies of versification, is hardly to be estimated; it requires an expenditure of time and thought which few men would give at all to a literary undertaking, and fewer still would bestow upon the work of another⁶.

The power of compression shown in the translation is truly remarkable, and ought to redeem the English language from a charge often brought against it—of want of conciseness. The translation does not contain an hundred lines more than the original; and, allowing for the greater length of the Greek line, probably no greater number of syllables.

The following citations may not unfairly represent our translator's method of rendering the most characteristic and most difficult parts of the play, the choruses. (See pp. 10, 11, and 51, v. 195 to 212, and 1245 to 1266.)

“Wives too, and greyhair'd mothers, round
The high-raised shrine, in suppliant guise
From every side have wended;
Over these bitter agonies
They lengthen out their mournful cries,
Whilst the loud Pæan's sparkling sound,
With sounds of wail is blended.
Wherefore Jove's golden daughter hear us,
Send smiling help to cheer us;

⁶ In this merit of merits in a translator,—close and accurate rendering,—Sir Francis has had a noble precedent in that great work, one of the most valuable presents that could have been made to the English reader, Wright's admirable translation of Dante.

And Ares, the death-spirit dire,
Who now, not arm'd for war, but still
With savage shoutings bent to kill,
Raves round us, a consuming fire,
Him, exiled from my country, force,
Re-rushing on his rapid course,
To turn him back again, and flee
To the great chamber of the sea,
Or where, around Barbaric shores,
The swell of Thracian surges roars."

" Man, child of dust, your little life I deem
No better than a baseless dream,
For who of human birth has looked on bliss
More stedfast to the eye than this ;
A something that may seem to shine,
And in its seeming straight decline ?—
Thy fate, lost Œdipus, is strong to show
That none are blessed here below.
Thy arrowy flight, too fortunate its aim,
Soared up, the pride of life to claim,
And that oracular grim thing of prey,
The virgin Sphinx, God gave thee power to slay.
When on thy native land in that dark hour
Death smote, like an imperial tower
For refuge and defence thou stood'st alone,
So that we placed thee on a throne,
And raised thee up to high renown,
Lord of this mighty Theban town.—
But who, from all we hear, more wretched now,
High heart of Œdipus, than thou ?
Who by sad change of lot is forced to dwell
With griefs and agonies more fell ? "

his vigour in dialogue let the following serve as an example, not infelicitous instance of the combination of the stateliness of Greek tragedy, with the liveliness of expression required in the dialogue by the countrymen of Shakspeare. (See p. 58, v. 1458-1467.)

" Having myself denounced against myself
Such a contaminating curse, how could I
Confront it here with an unshrinking eye ?
No, were there any power of crushing up

I cannot but think that the second line would be improved by omitting

*The fountain-head of sound within mine ears,
I would not rest till this afflicted frame
Were clean walled out from nature ; so I might
Live without sight, and hearing nothing ; for
To keep all senses dead to pain were best."*

The following quotation, from a speech of *Œdipus*, may also be given as a specimen of grave and vigorous versification. (See p. 13, v. 268 to 277.)

" Yea ! in the self-same curse, if to my knowledge
An inmate of my halls this man should be,
I bind myself to suffer every ill
I have invoked on him ; and as for you,
What I have said I charge you to fulfil
For my sake, for the god's, and for this land
Now withered up in godless desolation ;
Nay, though no deity had urged the guest,
When that a king of his great race was slain,
It were not right to leave it unatoned."

Of the two difficulties between which every translator of poetry finds himself pressed, of failing to give the sense of his original on one side, or of expressing himself in a harsh and unidiomatic manner on the other, our author certainly falls most frequently into the latter, and his dialogue is often open to the charge of stiffness. Yet this is undoubtedly the less fault of the two, and it must be remembered that the dialogue of the ancient tragedies was more laboured and stately than that in use on our stage. The heroes of Greek tragedy could scarcely speak like ordinary mortals, nor would the spirit of the original be fairly conveyed, unless the language were somewhat more stately than the English dramatic taste will easily endure. Yet the language has not always been brought to the flexibility, which, always desirable, is especially so for dialogue. In English blank verse, the ear wanting the accustomed stimulus of rhyme, makes the reader exceedingly intolerant of any flatness or want of vigour either in sense or sound. Milton is always especially careful so to modify his verses that the pauses may give the necessary variety, by not coinciding with the ends of the lines ; and, perhaps, something of the same kind may be discerned in the frequent breakings of the lines in the dialogues of Shakspeare. In the "*Œdipus Tyrannus*" the dialogue is so often inevitably divided into single lines, that the difficulty is probably not altogether surmountable.

In the first chorus (v. 170) the oracle is besought to "declare the same ;" a phraseology which appears to recal the legal, rather

than the poetical studies of the learned translator, and is surely more appropriate to an indictment than to an ode. This expression "the same," seems indeed to be rather a favourite with our translator, it occurs three times as the termination of a line (see v. 390 and 1030), not, we think, without a certain flatness of effect.

These faults are no doubt trifling, but the labour of correcting them is also trifling, and a minute perfection in a work of art is assuredly no trifle. We may hope to see these things amended in a future edition.

One mistake in the meaning may be noticed; the translation runs vv. 1187-8—

" faithful among the first,
To Laius, that is for a shepherd swain ;"

which sounds as if a shepherd, by some law of nature, was necessarily less honest than other men. In truth, *πιστός* signifies *trusted* as well as *trustworthy*; and the meaning is, that the shepherd in question was as much in the confidence of his master, as a man of his rank was likely to be, and this explains why he was charged with the important task of exposing *Œdipus*.

It is assuredly no light task to give an adequate and satisfactory rendering of one of the great authors of antiquity, difficult to be done at all, and almost, if not quite impossible, to be done without occasional stiffness and hardness. As it is one of the most useful and arduous, so it is one of the most meritorious of literary achievements; while it exacts more labour than original composition, it bestows less fame; nor would the necessary labour be given from any meaner motive than that pure love and disinterested devotion for art, which is at once the incentive, the test, and the reward of genius.

While the translation before us is certainly not exempt from faults of diction, though it sometimes wants grace, and still oftener ease, it may be truly said of it that it is a real translation; that there is scarcely an idea of the original which is not rendered, and that it fully and faithfully conveys to the English reader the mind and the sentiments of one of the great and most famous works of antiquity. This Sir Francis Doyle has done; and he who has done this has done much.

The form in which the present publication appears, is not undeserving of notice. It is one of the objects of the translator that the benefits of his work, as introducing the reader to a very important part of classical literature, should be extended as widely as possible, and should serve to lift up some portion of the veil which shrouds the ancient world from the eyes of that large portion of the reading public, whose early studies have not ren-

*The fountain-head of sound within mine ears,
 I would not rest till this afflicted frame
 Were clean walled out from nature ; so I might
 Live without sight, and hearing nothing ; for
 To keep all senses dead to pain were best."*

The following quotation, from a speech of *Œdipus*, may also be given as a specimen of grave and vigorous versification. (See p. 13, v. 268 to 277.)

" Yea ! in the self-same curse, if to my knowledge
 An inmate of my halls this man should be,
 I bind myself to suffer every ill
 I have invoked on him ; and as for you,
 What I have said I charge you to fulfil
 For my sake, for the god's, and for this land
Now withered up in godless desolation ;
 Nay, though no deity had urged the guest,
 When that a king of his great race was slain,
 It were not right to leave it unatton'd."

Of the two difficulties between which every translator of poetry finds himself pressed, of failing to give the sense of his original on one side, or of expressing himself in a harsh and unidiomatic manner on the other, our author certainly falls most frequently into the latter, and his dialogue is often open to the charge of stiffness. Yet this is undoubtedly the less fault of the two, and it must be remembered that the dialogue of the ancient tragedies was more laboured and stately than that in use on our stage. The heroes of Greek tragedy could scarcely speak like ordinary mortals, nor would the spirit of the original be fairly conveyed, unless the language were somewhat more stately than the English dramatic taste will easily endure. Yet the language has not always been brought to the flexibility, which, always desirable, is especially so for dialogue. In English blank verse, the ear wanting the accustomed stimulus of rhyme, makes the reader exceedingly intolerant of any flatness or want of vigour either in sense or sound. Milton is always especially careful so to modify his verses that the pauses may give the necessary variety, by not coinciding with the ends of the lines ; and, perhaps, something of the same kind may be discerned in the frequent breakings of the lines in the dialogues of Shakspeare. In the "*Œdipus Tyrannus*" the dialogue is so often inevitably divided into single lines, that the difficulty is probably not altogether surmountable.

In the first chorus (v. 170) the oracle is besought to "declare the same ;" a phraseology which appears to recal the legal, rather

tend to enlarge the one, or to purify the other, is matter of no mean importance. The literature which is current among a people can never have a light effect upon their tastes, their morals, or their happiness.

Nor is it only to the mere English reader that such a translation is of use. It may be made hardly less beneficial to the student. The inevitable habits and tendencies of all institutions for education go to concentrate attention upon the words rather than upon the meaning of authors; to lead the student to banquet upon the husk, and neglect the kernel; and to value a poet more for his difficulties than his beauties. We have ourselves known a passage from *Æschylus* set for translation to candidates for honours, which, from notorious corruption, was absolute nonsense. It will be in the recollection of most of our readers that Byron professed himself unable to enjoy Horace, so disgusted had he been by "that dull dry lesson, forced down word by word." And, doubtless, numbers must have felt the same, and been precluded from all taste for classical literature; shut out from many important sources, both of enjoyment and of improvement, by that exclusive attention to words into which all philological studies are so apt to degenerate. It is, no doubt, in the first place, necessary that an author should be understood; but this necessity is too apt to lead men, as in other pursuits, to take the means for the end, and to limit scholarship to a mere knowledge of the meaning of words, till, to use the metaphor of Bacon, they become money when they should have been counters.

It is obvious enough that such an exclusive course of study has a strong tendency to cramp and narrow the faculties. Nor is this all, the concentration of attention upon the dead languages is apt to cause a neglect of our own, the habit of *construing* of which Arnold lamented the substitution for *translation*, accustoms the ear and the taste to the strangest and most barbarous English. It is but a bad substitute, if while we learn to read good Greek, we learn also to write and speak bad English. Those strange productions, which in University language, are commonly termed *cribs*, literal translations of the classical authors into English prose, and which make a very important part of the ordinary University studies, can hardly fail to exercise an unfavourable effect, both upon the purity and geniality of style of those who are much accustomed to them. Let us hope that a version like the present, at once close enough to assist in the interpretation of the author, and elegant enough to afford a standard of taste, may help to lead to a better practice in this very important matter. The interpretation of a classical

author ought to be as much a lesson in English as in Greek or Latin.

Sir Francis Doyle gives us some promise that the present work may be only the first of a series of translations of the plays of Sophocles. We cannot conclude without the expression of a wish that this intention may not be without fruit. As the translator goes on, his work will become lighter, practice will beget facility, and the language of dramatic dialogue flow more easily from his pen. Many of the succeeding plays of Sophocles abound more in variety of situation and in passages of poetical beauty, than the one before us, and are more likely to arrest the attention and please the taste of a modern audience; and as the labour becomes lighter, the reward will be more sure and in more full measure.

We hope that the intended work may go on, and that it may remain as an enduring monument to the fame at once of the Greek and the English poet.

ART. VII.—1. *The Church, the Crown, and the State. Two Sermons. By the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A.* Cleaver: London.

2. *The Things of Cæsar and the Things of God. A Discourse by W. DODSWORTH, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras.* Masters: London.

3. *The Reformers of the Anglican Church, and Mr. Macaulay's History of England. Second Edition. By E. C. HARRINGTON, M.A., Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter.* London: Rivingtons.

4. *Addresses of the London Church Union.* Rivingtons.

5. *Rules of the London, Bristol, Metropolitan, Leicester, Leamington, Yeovil, Dorset, Plymouth, Gloucester, Church Unions.*

6. *The Present Crisis of the Church of England. Illustrated by a brief Inquiry as to the Royal Supremacy, &c. By W. J. IRONS, B.D., Vicar of Brompton.* London: Masters.

THERE is scarcely, perhaps, in the whole circle of secondary doctrines connected with Christianity, one that has furnished more room for controversy, and led to more serious divisions than the question of the relation of the temporal Government to religion. In the present day the Church of England stands almost alone, in ascribing to the State any authority over the Church. Such authority is disclaimed and resisted by the Church of Rome. It is equally resisted and denounced by Dissenters, as involving an anti-Christian usurpation on the one side, and a sacrifice of the Church's rights on the other. The modern schools of politics which date from the French Revolution, unite in declaring that the State has nothing to do with religion. In our own days we have seen the disruption of the Established Presbyterian system of Scotland on this question. In Ireland we have seen the Romish bishops and clergy again and again refuse the golden bait by which political parties have sought to place limits on their freedom, and to render them the agents of political parties. In France we have seen the Church engaged in a long and strenuous resistance to the State, and gradually winning its way to liberty. In Prussia we have seen the State divesting itself of power over the various religious confessions and restoring them to freedom. The cause of dissension in all these cases has been the same. The State has gradually lost, or has long been entirely devoid of any substantial agreement of objects and principles with the

Church. It has not exercised its power for the good of the Church, but simply for its own good, without caring whether the Church suffers or not in the process.

Nor have there been wanting amongst the members of the Church of England instances of persons who have entertained opinions adverse to the exercise of any power by the State in ecclesiastical matters. The non-juring writers generally took very strong ground on this subject; and the doctrines of Leslie, and Dodwell, and Johnson, and many other able men who held the same views, have not been without adherents at any time in the English Church. The doctrines, however, of the independence of the Church on the temporal power, were not for a long time regarded with favour in the Church of England. Until the present generation, the supremacy of the Crown was generally looked on as a sacred and distinctive tenet of the Church of England, which every orthodox Churchman was bound to defend most vigorously, and to look with pious horror on every one who dreamt of the separation of Church and State. And so matters continued during the reigns of the Georges. The regal supremacy was then as much prized and as jealously guarded by Churchmen as it had ever been. The ground commonly taken against the agitation of the Romish claims for political power was its inconsistency with the king's supremacy. The union of Church and State was all but an article of faith.

Now, however, matters are changed. The Church is greatly divided on the question of its union with the State. Resistance is manifested in many ways to State measures. Jealousy is shown of State interference. State patronage is not so much valued, and the royal supremacy is treated without much ceremony. The Church and State are no longer on good terms, though they are allied. There is dissension between the two parties—the one trying to hold its grasp as well as it can over a subject that is getting every day more restive, and the other becoming each day more irritated and uneasy under an authority which has become burdensome.

And how has all this come to pass? Is "Puseyism" the evil spirit that has made the Church no longer the acquiescent and easily-managed body that it was? Perhaps it *has* done something in this way; and yet "Puseyism" did not cause Mr. Baptist Noel to forsake the Church, nor can it exclusively bear the responsibility of the change which has come over us.

It is the State itself which has *altered its position* in regard to the Church, and has, therefore, wrought a change in the mind of the Church. During the reigns of the Georges, the Sovereign, the Ministers, the Lords and the Commons were all Churchmen.

No Dissenter or Romanist was admitted into the Royal Councils, or could legislate for or against the Church. The State may have employed its Church patronage without reference to the true interests of religion ; but it was firm and resolute in its support of the Church. Within the last thirty years, however, all this is changed. Dissenters, Romanists, Socinians, are admissible to all the offices of the State : they are eligible to Parliament ; they are ministers of state and privy-councillors. The sovereign power has gradually fallen into the hands of the ministers of the Crown, who are virtually appointed and dismissed by a House of Commons, which includes sectarians of all kinds, and radical enemies of the Church. And, accordingly, what has been the result ? In the first place, the Church of Ireland has been ruined by the suppression of half its episcopal sees ; by the introduction of poor laws, by which its property is taxed twice as heavily as that of the laity ; by the confiscation of a quarter of its revenues in the times of the Reform Bill, and a third of the remainder by the Corn Law Bill ; by the withdrawal of Government aid from its educational establishments, and the institution of rival establishments, with a view to satisfy Romanists and Dissenters ; by the abuse of the Crown patronage to compel the Church to support an educational system to which it objects ; by the foundation of colleges for Romanists and dissenters, in opposition to the established University ; by the endowment of Maynooth, and the augmentation thus given to the means and influence of Romanism ; by the further endowment of Presbyterianism, and the establishment of sectarian ministers as authorized to celebrate marriages ; by the recognition of the titles and authority of Romish ecclesiastics, and the avowed wish in all ways to conciliate and aid them ; by the discouragement of all persons and parties favourable to the continuance of the ascendancy of the Church, or the preservation of her rights or revenues. We think there can be little doubt that the State has changed its position in regard to the Church in Ireland.

But all, perhaps, has remained as before in the *English* Church. We can hardly say this on a survey of the facts of the case. True, the progress of events has been gradual here as it has been in Ireland, yet it is not less evident or alarming. Dissent, long ago, obtained its full share of Parliamentary grants for education. Those grants are now made to Romish, and Wesleyan Methodist schools as much as to Church schools. Romish bishops are salaried in the colonies, and placed on a level with our own, or even above them. Aid is refused to schools of an exclusively and strictly Church character. The Church is first limited by the Tithe Commutation Act to a certain extent of property, so that

she can derive no benefit from future improvements in value ; and this Act has scarcely come into operation, till, by the alteration in the Corn Laws, *one-third of her income is swept away !* Men of unsound theological tenets, tinged with the latitudinarian philosophy of the day, are promoted to her bishoprics, and other influential positions. The Crown patronage may be exercised by persons who attend sectarian worship. The Church is refused any further aid from public funds ; and her own property is taken out of her hands and dealt with by Parliament. Her universities are deprived of their exclusive privileges, as far as possible, and an opposite system encouraged. She is refused the organization of a hierarchy adequate to her wants, while she sees Romanism freely, and without check, developing itself.

And besides the evils which have actually taken effect, the Church has, on many occasions, been in great perils. The Church rates have often been nearly extinguished. The subversion of her laws of marriage has been nearly successful. The most dangerous plans of latitudinarian education have been only just escaped. Ours has been a troubled and anxious existence for the last twenty years, continually on the verge of fearful evils ; and in the struggle we have already lost annual income to the amount of more than a million. Events, too, have brought out in strong relief the fact that the State, latitudinarian or unbelieving as it now is, has the power of influencing the *doctrinal* teaching of the Church by its appointments to benefices ; and that it is evidently inclined to do so ; and, further, that it can nominate who it pleases to act on the tribunal for the judgment of Church causes which involve doctrinal questions.

On a survey of what has been going on for the last twenty years, we think no one can wonder that the feelings of the Church of England towards the State should be somewhat changed. The spirit of legislation as regards the Church has totally altered. A great transition is in progress. It cannot be a matter of indifference to the Church whether those who enact laws are friendly to her, or otherwise. She cannot look upon a State exclusively attached to her, and a State which includes all her opponents, in exactly the same point of view. Hence it is perfectly natural, that the supremacy which was cherished at one time, should be regarded with different feelings at another.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that "Puseyism," as it is called, has been the only cause of change in the Church's views of the State supremacy. It might with more justice be said, that the Church has been driven by the exigencies of her position to inquire into first principles, and to look for the rules and the precedents which are to guide her in the painful trials to which

she is exposed from the alienation of the State. It is the State which has broken the alliance, not the Church.

Deeply painful, however, as is much of what we have witnessed, in the evidence it affords of a total change on the part of the State towards the Church, still we must be careful, lest, in adapting our maxims to the altered circumstances in which we are placed, we should so state the question as to cast undeserved blame upon the Church of England in former ages, or contradict and deny those principles which she has sanctioned in her formularies. On this account we think the doctrines of the Non-jurors, in the relations of Church and State, are not adapted to the present day, though they are more so than those of many of our writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which ascribe powers to the State which the State itself has ceased to assert. The only safe and reasonable ground to take seems to us to be this:—that the formularies of the Church of England were composed in contemplation of a different state of things from that which now exists, and that the Church assumed as a necessary condition in her notion of temporal sovereignty—its Christianity, and its reality—but that it has now lost both these conditions.

The temporal sovereignty has lost its Christianity, as it was understood by the Church, because, though the *person* of the Sovereign remains Christian, the sovereign *power* is exercised by a body which is not Christian, and by its nominees. The Parliament is no longer Christian in the sense of the Church, because it includes members holding every possible variety of religious error, and even many infidels. The ministry are the nominees of this Parliament, and really derive power from it; and the *powers* of the Sovereign are exercised by the ministry. The Sovereign is therefore only personally Christian; *officially* he is not so in the sense of the Church.

The hypothesis on which the Church bases her recognition of the régál supremacy, is no longer in existence. The Thirty-seventh Article—"Of the civil magistrates"—speaks only of the prerogative "which we see to have been given always to all GODLY Princes in Holy Scriptures by God Himself." David and Solomon, Hezekiah, Jehu and Josiah, were indeed godly in their dealings with religion and their subjects; but that power was used in contradiction to God's commands, when it was employed by ungodly kings in introducing idolatries into the Temple, and combining the worship of the true God with that of the gods of the heathen, and other actions subversive of true religion. Therefore, if the Article refers only to the power given to godly princes, we cannot in justice assume that it is meant to apply in the same way to an "ungodly" sovereignty. The example of a David or

a Josiah is not parallel to that of a Jeroboam or an Ahab. The Church which might gladly recognize a supremacy in a Constantine, a Theodosius, an Edward, or an Elizabeth, would not feel that the same Divine sanction was given to the supremacy of a Constantius, a Julian, a Valens, or a Cromwell. We are not saying that the Church may not and does not recognize a supremacy sometimes even in infidel sovereignties; but it is a very different thing from that which is recognized in godly and Christian sovereignties. In England, at present, we subscribe to views which the State has repudiated. We declare the Sovereign to be supreme in all causes and over all persons—all estates and degrees. But the Sovereigns of England have abandoned that power. They do not *claim* to be supreme over all persons and in all causes. They sanction the *Papal* supremacy over one portion of the people, and another portion they allow to reject all supremacy but their own. They do not “punish with the civil sword the evil-doers,” as the godly kings in Scripture did; but permit idolatries and heresies to flourish unchecked, and even encouraged. If, therefore, we still declare that the Sovereign is supreme in religious matters over all the people, we can only mean that he is so in the abstract, and by God’s ordinance, in order to promote God’s glory; but that he is no longer so in fact and reality, in the full meaning of the Church. The supremacy, *in its present state*, has no support from our formularies, or from the Scriptures. It is the mere exercise of certain legal prerogatives given by Act of Parliament. With mere prerogative we are in no way concerned as a matter of principle. The Parliament may increase or diminish the prerogative of the executive power, but this is a mere matter of State arrangement, and is based on fitness, expediency, or justice; not on the law of God and religious considerations. The temporal power has long since foregone all claims founded on *religious* considerations; and yet the Church of England bases the supremacy which she acknowledges, and which, as understood by her, has become a theory and a tradition, on Scripture and God’s will only.

Our reply then to those who blame our writers at the Reformation or subsequently, or who even censure the Articles and formularies of the Church of England, as recognizing an ecclesiastical supremacy in the Sovereign, is, that it was conceded only on the supposition that the prince was “godly,” *i. e.* a sincere adherent of the true faith, and that his power was given and was to be used for the welfare of God’s Church and the promotion of God’s glory. The temporal power, in those times, took precisely the same view, and was extremely busy in regulating and reforming religious matters, and repressing evil-doers of all kinds. The

“civil sword” was active against heretics. And this was just what Josiah and such godly kings did under the old Covenant.

The Canons of 1604 declare that—

“Whosoever shall affirm that the King’s Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the *godly* kings had among the Jews, and *Christian* emperors of the primitive Church, or impeach any part of his regal supremacy in the said causes restored to the Crown, and by the laws of the realm herein established, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of these his wicked errors.”

It is evident that the Church supposed in this canon that the Crown of England would always be “Christian” and “godly,” and would never tolerate or encourage schism and heresy by legal enactments. The Sovereigns of England are still Christian in their personal capacity; but the fact is, that if they were to cease to be of the communion of the Church, or to become dissenters, Romanists, or open unbelievers, the mere *letter* of the canon and Articles, detached from their spirit, might be quoted to prove that God had given to unbelievers or idolatrous princes the government of His Church. And no matter how grossly and monstrously the legal powers of the State were abused—even if they were employed in the most manifest contradiction to the doctrines and belief of the Church—even if they were employed for the purpose of encouraging Romanism, or infidelity, or rationalism, or Unitarianism in the Church, and introducing by legal process any amount of heresy into her, the State and its ministers would still appeal at *law* to the letter of the Articles, and the canons, and the statutes of the realm, passed when the realm was governed by orthodox princes.

Opinions, however, cannot be tied down in the present day to exactly such an interpretation of the supremacy of the Crown, as may be most in accordance with the views of politicians. The mind of the Church of England will venture to think for itself, and will look at the facts of the case, notwithstanding the dicta of ministers, lawyers, and journals. The sovereign power in England is personally irresponsible and infallible in the eye of the law, and should be so in the eyes of all Churchmen; but the exercise of the prerogatives of the Crown is in the hands of responsible ministers; the power of the Crown is *only exercised through ministers* now; and it is this which has ceased to be “godly” or “Christian” in the sense of the Church of England. It is out of the question to succeed any longer in blinding the public mind to the gradual revolution which has taken place in the relations of the State to

the Church. There is *some* difference between the state of things in 1550 and in 1850.

We readily admit that Henry VIII., and one or two of his successors, exaggerated the notion of the regal supremacy, and that some of our prelates and divines have occasionally put forward opinions, or consented to acts of royal power, which have, to say the least, been questionable. But setting aside these, as matters of no great importance, we cordially and fully sympathize with the feelings of those who were ready to concur in what were in some degree irregularities, in associating themselves with the laudable intentions of "Christian" and "godly" sovereigns; of sovereigns, who were more than shadows of kingly power, but who wielded in their own persons the authority of the State—of sovereigns, earnest in their protection and purification of the Church, and in their efforts to reduce all the nation into obedience to the true faith.

How widely changed is the sovereign power in England now! Time has been the greatest innovator of all. Names have lost their meaning. The "supremacy of the *Crown*" is in reality a "misnomer." It no longer means the supremacy of the head of the State, but the supremacy of an oligarchy of ministers called to their office by the House of Commons. Hence it must be expected that ministers and legislators should be most anxious to maintain what they call the "supremacy of the *Crown*," which really means *their own supremacy*.

It is a truth which we think no right thinking person can dispute, that if God has ever authorized Jewish and Christian princes to exercise jurisdiction and control over the Church, it has been simply for the promotion of His glory, and His designs for the salvation of men. It has not been for the purpose of augmenting the power of the State, or for any material or earthly objects. Princes have been authorized by God to co-operate thus with their earthly means and power in promoting His kingdom upon earth, with that express object.

There are many persons, to whom the statement of such opinions will seem strange and unreasonable, and we fear that all who look on the question in this point of view, and act on that view in any degree, must be prepared to hear themselves described as disloyal, turbulent, and mischievous men—as disturbers of the Church, and as inconsistent in remaining in her communion. We think that the increasing exigencies of the times, and the increasing manifestations of the State's real character, will render faithful men more and more indifferent to such accusations, and more and more resolved in their opinions and course of action. We are placed in circumstances of extreme difficulty. The letter

of institutions and formularies, in opposition to their real meaning and spirit, is against us. An unbelieving State has taken the place of a Christian one. The Church is, in the face of this state of things, divided to such an extent, that whatever is taken up by one party is sure to be opposed by the other, or looked on with jealousy. The State has, therefore, fearful odds in its favour, in the contest to remodel the Church on its own principles of indifference. There is, however, one, and only one, *ultimate* remedy left. It may be impossible to induce the Church *generally* to unite in demanding, or the State to yield, any alteration and adaptation of its relations and powers to the exigencies of the nineteenth century. We may ask in vain for Convocation; we may appeal in vain even to the heads of our Church. Caution on the one hand, and love of power on the other, may attempt to quash all our demands. We may be told to remain satisfied with the institutions of the sixteenth century, pervaded by the spirit and principles of the nineteenth, and to fold our hands in resignation to the will of God. We may be told to refrain from seeking what our rulers are unwilling to grant, and to remain as we are, in order to avoid greater risks and dangers. To these injunctions and exhortations we *dare* not yield acquiescence. We cannot, and ought not, to remain in peace, while the inheritance of the Lord is defiled, and the greatest interests of the Church—its most vital truths, and its spiritual efficiency—are endangered in so many ways. What then is our remedy? It consists in PERSEVERANCE. If the claims of the Church are not conceded—if the strong arm of power is raised to crush attempts at Reform which are as essential now as they were in the sixteenth century, then we do not say, “Leave the Church.” On the contrary, we say, “Remain firmly in the Church, to struggle for her through evil report and good report, as faithful soldiers of JESUS CHRIST. Remain in her—hold your ground—quit you like men. Let no extravagance disgrace you; let no disloyalty to the Church find a place in your hearts. Pay the most perfect respect to constituted authorities; but never rest until you have gained a sufficient Reform of the existing relations of Church and State. If others will not join you, go on without them; and you will find that weariness and indifference will, in the course of years, concede to you those claims, for the sake of peace, which never will be yielded as a matter of justice.”

The really faithful members of the Church have, we think, only this course before them. They must not allow themselves to be irritated or dispirited; but they must be indefatigably persevering. They must act in the mode which is taken by a minority in the House of Commons, determined to carry their point;

and they will in all probability carry it, if they persevere so earnestly and so long as to become a real trouble to the State. A trifling or intermittent opposition will be disregarded: it is only a vigorous, a diversified, a never-ceasing activity that is likely to prevail. That movement must be strictly a "Church of England" one, or it will be powerless.

And this brings us to a subject on which we have been for some time inclined to speak—a subject of daily increasing importance. We allude to the formation of "Church Unions," and the line of policy which they should pursue.

The institution of "Church Unions" began about two years since, with a view to enlist the *combined* exertions of Churchmen for the attainment of certain objects, on the desirableness of which all Churchmen are agreed, or at least Churchmen of all parties. We refer to such measures as an increase in the number of bishops, with due provision for the appointment of persons well qualified for that sacred office, the extension of the Church; the restoration of an Ecclesiastical legislature in place of Parliamentary legislation in Church matters; and the revival of Church discipline. The hope of the founders of these societies was, that the unexceptionableness of their objects would have enlisted the general co-operation of Churchmen of all shades of opinion. That hope, however, has been imperfectly realized; for the Evangelical party has, to a considerable extent, stood aloof, and declined to unite in the movement. We must confess that, with the knowledge of the original object of Church Unions fully before us, we have lamented the partial character of the movement—its being left so much to men of one class of views in the Church—to those with whom we generally agree. We have observed, from time to time, with regret, that the leading Church Union established at Bristol has appeared to have forgotten the simple general objects prominently put forth at its foundation, and has occupied itself almost exclusively with the important question of National Education. We have also felt much regret at the resolutions which have been published occasionally, with the signatures of the able and energetic secretaries of the Bristol Union, on a variety of subjects which were certainly very far from being of that class on which Churchmen are agreed. We could not see the advantage of expressing opinions on the conduct of bishops, or on other disputed questions; and it seemed that a course was being taken which was calculated to defeat entirely the object of union and co-operation with which such societies were formed originally. We must confess that we have often lamented a course which seemed to be frustrating all the hopes which we had conceived from the institution of those societies. It seemed that if only one part of

the Church engaged in the effort to obtain sufficient securities from the State, there could be no hope of success, humanly speaking, considering the powers arrayed against us.

But in fact, whatever may be the cause, the Evangelical section of the Church appears to be at present completely under the influence of the State; and it would, most probably, have been impossible, under any circumstances, to have secured their co-operation. We are inclined to think that no amount of prudence and forbearance would have enlisted them in the cause of ecclesiastical freedom. They are, apparently, satisfied at the present prospects of the Church, and possibly look to the exaltation of their own views under the influence of Government patronage; and to a depression of opinions, which they reject, under the discouragement of the State and of the chief heads of the Church. They remain quiescent at all events, and, perhaps, they may even pass from this state of quiescence to one of actual support of Government in its contest with the Church.

The hope of the co-operation of the Evangelical party in the Church's cause must, therefore, be relinquished with regret; and if there had not been sufficient indications already that they were resolved to stand aloof from any movement such as that of the Church Unions, the state of things connected with the recent decision by the Committee of Council in the Gorham case, shows that it would be now hopeless to attempt any combination of parties. The extreme pressure of these times would compel any association to take some side in the controversy.

Since circumstances have taken this direction, so different from what had been originally contemplated, it remains to make the best of them. It is, in our opinion, a matter of imperative duty in Churchmen to *combine* in the present times for counsel and mutual encouragement. In the midst of the increasing dangers of the Church—dangers affecting her temporal position, and the permanence of her institutions, and laws, and doctrines—it is no longer possible to remain passive, or to go on contented with the system of defence or management which has permitted so many dangerous innovations already. The Church is without defenders in the House of Commons. We have many assailants and reformers of a certain kind there; but we see no body of men who take up our cause and seek to advance it. We have many friends, but they are very quiet and retiring friends, who are led by other parties, and who look to their political connexions before they look to the cause of the Church of England. We have no Montalembert. The same may be said of the House of Lords. There are many excellent bishops and peers; but we have no set of men there endeavouring systematically to push forward the cause of

the Church. Nor can it be expected, perhaps, that it should be much otherwise in the House of Lords. In saying this, however, we would not be understood to be insensible of the efforts of some excellent prelates to obtain benefits for the Church. More especially would we acknowledge with gratitude the recent exertions of the Lord Bishop of London to obtain an improvement in the constitution of the appellate tribunal for the decision of causes involving doctrine; the speeches of the Lord Bishop of Chichester and other peers on the education question; and the well-judged efforts of the Earl of Powis, the Bishop of Salisbury, and others, prelates and peers, in reference to the Ecclesiastical Commission Bill. In all this there is much to gratify and encourage; and, could the single point of the re-establishment of Convocation be carried, there could be no further necessity for any voluntary combination of Churchmen; but, until either there is a decided, active, and influential Church interest in the House of Lords or Commons, or until Convocation is *free to act*, we think that it is imperatively necessary that some kind of organization should exist amongst Churchmen.

Undoubtedly there are and will be evils in any such organization. Most happy should we be to see its necessity superseded by the organization of a satisfactory Church party in Parliament, or by the immediate restoration of Convocation with full and unshackled powers of deliberation; but nothing less than one or other of these events, including in the former case the avowed object of obtaining the restoration of the constitutional legislature of the Church, would, in our opinion, justify Churchmen, in respect of their duties to the Church and to its Divine Head, in retiring from the united struggle for religious liberty and security.

We now have the Church Unions as a means of co-operation amongst Churchmen. It is true that they do not represent all parts of the Church. They do, however, represent a very large part, probably the majority. We still trust and hope, and, as far as we may, entreat that the Church Unions will abstain, *as far as possible*, from any language or proceedings calculated to offend and irritate the Evangelical party; because it should be considered that future events may possibly in some degree change their attitude of neutrality into one of co-operation, and the door should be left open as far as possible; and the contest in itself *is not for the purpose of exalting or depressing any party in the Church; but for the purpose of restoring the rights of the Church*. But their co-operation is, we trust, not essential to the success of the Church's cause.

The contest on the subject of education, which has been so perseveringly kept up, is a sufficient proof of what may be effected

by zeal and union. Great effects have followed from the agitation of the question so far. The Committee of Council have given way on many points, and every one sees that education will receive a most serious check, unless means be taken to satisfy the Church. We trust that this struggle will be persisted in, with the temper, energy, and firmness which have hitherto characterized it. The evident irritation of the President of the Council on a recent occasion, intimates sufficiently the pressure brought to bear upon the Government. Let that pressure be continued without abatement or respite, and they will give way at length, wearied out.

To this struggle will now be added, we presume, a call for *Convocation*, to settle the baptismal controversy which has arisen, and to act as the permanent legislature of the Church. And in this, we think, there is so much that appeals to the common sense and feeling of all attached members of the Church of England, that it is likely gradually to command general support. The protection of the Church's faith is of quite as much importance and interest as the education question. A Parliament containing Dissenters, Romanists, Quakers, Socinians, and Infidels, is obviously not the proper legislature for Church questions. Every one must acknowledge this, and see that the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and Roman Catholic Emancipation, have totally changed the character of that body. Independently of which, the call for Convocation appeals to our natural desires for *religious liberty*, and is directed to the recovery of *constitutional rights* long withheld. It is a demand not unsuited to the spirit of the age, appealing on intelligible grounds to the sense of natural justice as well as of religion. We, therefore, anticipate extensive and vigorous support being given to the demand for the liberty of Convocation. This will bring another pressure on Government; and the jealousy with which all its measures will be watched, and, when necessary, opposed and resisted, will at length, if persevered in, bring it to make terms with the Church.

Although, therefore, we deeply regret the quarrelling, dissension, agitation, disturbance, and irritation which now exists, and which must continue to exist and to increase, we regard it as a necessary evil. It all arises simply from the alteration of the State from a "Church of England" character, to indifference in religion; and the want of a fair revision, by the Legislature, of the relations between Church and State, which ought to have followed immediately on the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and Roman Catholic Emancipation.

Having thus stated our views on the existing relations of Church and State, and the necessity of considerable alterations,

we must produce a few extracts from the publications mentioned at the head of this article, with a view to show the questions which have been stirred up by the operation of the existing state of things. We must first quote the following striking passages from Mr. Dodsworth's publication :—

“ If then these things be so, it seems plain, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that what is now transacting in the highest place in this kingdom, and to which so much attention is now justly directed, is an invasion of the Church's office. It is the civil power interfering in a matter which does not belong to it, taking cognizance of a matter altogether out of its province ; it is giving unto Cæsar the things which are God's. For what are the facts of the case ? Here is a temporal or civil court sitting in judgment, with power to confirm or reverse a decision, on matters of doctrine, in the courts of the Church. I am aware of what is here said by some, that it is a question of facts rather than of doctrine ; that the question is not so much what is the doctrine of the Church of England, as the fitness of the person supposing himself to be aggrieved to minister at her altars. It may be replied, that in such a case it is impossible to separate between facts and doctrines ; that in deciding upon one the decision must virtually include the other. For, since the fitness of the person in question depends upon the accordance or non-accordance of his doctrines with the doctrines of the Church, it is impossible to decide upon that fitness without first deciding what the doctrine of the Church is.

“ Others have maintained that it is a matter of property, because the possession of a living is involved in it. But this it plainly is not, as well for other reasons as this, that a temporal court exists in which the question of property may be rightly settled.

“ Others, again, have said that this decision will settle no law of the Church, but only the interpretation of the law : to which it may be replied, he who finally interprets the law in effect makes it ; for the force of law obviously depends upon its application. And this remark most especially applies where, as in the present case, the Church has no legislative synod to correct the decisions of its law.

“ But, without insisting upon these points, I must say that it is too grave and great a matter to be put aside upon any mere theory, however true. It is really and practically, in the common-sense view of a people, themselves pre-eminently practical, an inquiry into doctrine.

“ The matter practically to be decided is, whether the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is the *authoritative* doctrine of the Church of England : whether it may be taught, not as the private opinion of this person or that, as the authoritative doctrine of the Church, that our children are made in baptism the children of God : whether the Church teaches us to regard them as partakers of spiritual grace, or leaves us to affirm it, to deny it, or doubt it as we please. It is indeed, my

brethren, a most vital doctrine that is called in question ; one which lies at the foundation of all Christian teaching, and must influence it at every step. And I am heartily glad that this is so : I mean that it is a question of such great moment, and not any smaller matter that is in dispute, because it affords a better hope that the grievous wrongfulness of the proceeding may be clearly seen. For let me ask any fair man of plain common sense, is this a matter suitable to be brought before a temporal court ? Is this a matter, right or wrong as the decision may be, in which the Church ought to sit quietly by, and see the State step in and decide for her ? A temporal court sitting by temporal authority to decide for us whether we may teach what we believe Christ has enjoined upon us to teach ! to decide for us whether or not we are bound to tell you that you lie under the blessing or the burden of the gift of heavenly life !

“ Were we to acquiesce in such a state of things, how should we be put to shame by other religious bodies, less blessed and less responsible than ourselves ; by bodies to which we have been fain to refuse the name of Church. We have recently seen what sacrifice multitudes of zealous men in the Presbyterian establishment of Scotland were ready to make, and did make, under a supposed invasion of spiritual rights immeasurably less important than this. Whatever might be the merits of their cause, who can but honour the manly stand which they made for what they deemed to be the prerogative of Christ, and of the sacred rights of conscience ? And does not every dissenting body in the land assert its right to judge of its own doctrines ? Would the Wesleyans, or Independents, or Baptists, or any other sect, endure that the civil power should change one jot or tittle of their peculiar tenets ? Nay, is not their dissent for the most part grounded upon their refusal to allow the Church itself to dictate to them in such matters ? and can it be a right thing to demand on the part of the State, can it be endurable on the part of the Church, (that body which we must maintain has an exclusive title to spiritual power,) that this intrusion should be made into things sacred, and this violence done to conscience ? Can it be intended by the people of this great nation to inflict upon us, nay, and still more upon themselves, so great wrong—to subject us to such a plain and palpable injustice ? This surely cannot be. The injury could not be intentional. People have not known of its existence. If the Church be recognized in any sense, or to any extent, as the teacher of the people, it could scarcely be intended thus to degrade her in the eyes of her children ; nay, and to rob her of that sacred deposit of the faith, and of the office of being sole keeper of the faith, which she cannot part with without unfaithfulness to Him Who intrusted her with it.

“ There is indeed in this case a feature of aggravation, which, though I cannot admit that it enters as an element into the subject of our complaint, may illustrate the magnitude of the evil. I have spoken of the court to which this sacred matter of Christian doctrine is referred, merely as a temporal court, that is, a court sitting by authority only of the temporal power. And on this, I repeat, I would found the strength

of the objection to it. This would remain in all its strength, even if all its members were bound under solemn obligations and duties to the Church as her own members. But it must not be overlooked, that according to the existing constitution of this country the members actually sitting to decide such questions may all be dissenters, of any faith, or no faith at all. So, to put a case, and not a very extreme case, it may be on some future occasion that the doctrine of our Lord's true divinity may come to be questioned in the same way that baptismal regeneration now is; and it might be that every member of the court who is to decide it might himself be an unbeliever in the doctrine. Thus a court composed of Socinians would sit to decide whether the Church holds the true doctrine of our Lord's divine nature! Why, surely it only requires that such a serious grievance, involving such fatal results, should be known, in order to be appreciated. Who can defend it? What pious Christian can think of it without horror?"—pp. 12—16.

The subject here more immediately under discussion is one which requires a few remarks. We allude to the constitution and office of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. We believe that every one feels that the Committee of Council is not a proper tribunal for the decision of doctrinal questions. In the recent decision in the case of Gorham, the Committee itself disclaims any such power; and in truth, with the highest respect for that Committee, it would be perfectly absurd to suppose it invested with any power of the kind. That a body which includes distinguished personages who are not in communion with the Church of England, should be invested with the power of deciding what her doctrines are, would be monstrous. That Lords Brougham and Campbell, Sir Stephen Lushington, &c., should be invested with the power of deciding, without the Bishops of the Church of England, and in opposition to the Bishops if they liked it, what shall and shall not be taught by clergy of the Church, would be really absurd. To give to a certain set of lawyers the power of deciding the faith of the Church of England, would be as reasonable as that system which gives to Messrs. Cobden, Bright, Fox, and O'Connell the power of deciding on her discipline and morality. But, while we say this, we are not prepared to deny that the temporal power may fairly, and legitimately, under certain conditions, take cognizance in its courts of causes which have passed before the Church tribunals. It must be remembered that there are certain temporal rights connected with the occupation of benefices, which have always been admitted to furnish some reason for the interference of the temporal power, in case of appeal from the proceedings of the spiritual power. It has not merely been the custom in England to admit such appeal, which is continually made to the Court of Queen's Bench, and

without any objection, as far as we have observed; but the very same practice prevails, and has for ages prevailed in every country of Christendom. In all Roman Catholic countries, just as much as in England, appeals are made to temporal courts from spiritual, that is, in fact, to the Crown. So that the supremacy of the Crown or the State (whatever be the form of government) is more or less admitted or enforced, in practice, in all parts of the world. We think, however, that it is perfectly obvious that such appeal must be to the temporal power, not as invested by God with the power of deciding grave questions of controversy in the Church, but for the purpose of correcting manifest excesses in the action of the Spiritual Courts; such excesses as argue a plain want of justice, or an evident partiality; or an infringement on ordinary rights and liberties. The principle of an appeal so guarded will, we think, be conceded by every one, not only as fair in itself, but as consistent with the practice of Christian Churches and States from the period when the State became Christian.

Nay, there is even a higher power than this in Christian states; for we maintain, that ecclesiastical history shows throughout, that Christian princes have interfered in general controversies on matters of faith; and have often acted most effectively and with the approbation of all good Churchmen, for the suppression of heresy and schisms. Need we refer to the General Councils which were convened by Christian princes, and confirmed by their laws? Constantine the Great received appeals from the decrees of Synods, and commanded causes to be reheard by Bishops, thus exercising, without dispute, a supreme power in Ecclesiastical causes. But in all these cases, the temporal power never arrogated to *itself* the decision of controversies in matters of faith or general discipline. It availed itself always of the constituted authorities in the Church.—It recognized in them the commission given by Jesus Christ to teach the Gospel. It did not take on itself the office of teaching in the Church; and we are borne out by the Thirty-seventh Article, in saying, that such is not the office of Christian sovereigns.

Where matters of form, or regularity of proceeding, or moral conduct of individuals, or other points not affecting the faith, morality, or discipline of the Church, as a body, are in question, the State is competent to receive appeals from Church tribunals, and to decide them in its ordinary courts, constituted as it may deem most advisable for the ends of justice. The Judicial Committee of Council appears to us very well calculated to exercise the powers of the State in all such matters, and we should be satisfied with any similar tribunal to which the State might devolve its power in these causes. The language of St. Paul, (1 Cor. vi.

2—5,) appears to render it a matter of indifference who may judge in minor matters of difference between man and man.

But the case is widely different when the cause refers to the doctrines of the Gospel—when it relates to the teaching of doctrine, *viz.* the general belief, discipline, or morality of the Church. Here we have in the Scriptures the precedent of the Assembly of the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at Jerusalem, (Acts xv.) to guide us. Such matters are of vital importance, and are not to be submitted to the ordinary tribunals. The Committee of Council, or any similar body consisting merely of State functionaries, or persons skilled in the law of the land, is evidently unfitted to decide here. The aid of the Church itself must be invoked, *i. e.* the State is bound to call in and avail itself of the judgment of the Bishops of the Church; and this is, we think, fairly provided for by the Bill of the Bishop of London now before Parliament. It is difficult to speak positively on such questions without full consideration. We think that, if such a tribunal is to be established, it would be *desirable* that the subject should be discussed in Convocation. But, at the same time, we are not prepared to say, that the consent of Convocation is necessary to give validity to the acts of such a tribunal as the Bishop of London proposes. The State is bound, in justice, and in prudence too, not to attempt to decide questions involving doctrine, without the Bishops of the Church, or a sufficient proportion of them *fairly* chosen. But if the tribunal proposed by the Bishop of London were conceded, we are really of opinion, that the Church ought to be contented with the arrangement, as far as the exercise of the temporal power in such a court is concerned.

Having premised these remarks, we have to notice some resolutions proposed at a meeting of an influential Church Union, previously to the decision on the Gorham case. They are as follows:—

“Resolved—

“1. That by the suit of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, now pending by appeal in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as well as by the case of *Mastin v. Escott*, in the year 1842, it appears that the State exercises a power to confirm, reverse, or vary, by a final judicial sentence, the decisions and interpretations of the courts of the Church in matters of doctrine.

“2. That a power to interpret the formularies of the Church by a final and definitive judgment (the Synod of the Church not being, in practice, admitted to declare the doctrine of the Church irrespective of such sentence,) becomes, in effect, a power to declare and to make such interpretations binding on the Church.

“3. That while the fullest confidence may be placed in the integrity

and legal ability of the Judges in the case now pending, nevertheless no judgment can be pronounced by them either one way or the other, without affirming the false principle on which, in reference to spiritual matters, the tribunal itself is constituted.

"4. That whereas, the Universal Church alone possesses, by the commission and command of its Divine Founder, the power of defining in matter of doctrine; and, subject to the same, particular Churches alone possess, within their sphere, the power of interpreting and declaring, by final judicial sentence, the intention of such definitions as the Universal Church has framed, it appears that the power claimed and exercised by the State, through the Judicial Committee, in taking cognizance of doctrinal questions, is contrary to the law of CHRIST.

"5. That in the present state of the law nothing hinders but that an interpretation of doctrine judged to be unsound by the Courts of the Church may be finally declared sound by the Judicial Committee; or that a person who shall have been judged to be unfit for cure of souls by the spiritual tribunal may be declared fit for cure of souls by the civil power.

"6. That the existence of such a state of the law cannot be reconciled with the Divine constitution and office of the Church.

"7. That the exercise of power in such matters under such state of the law endangers the public maintenance of the Faith of CHRIST.

"8. That the existence of such a state of things constitutes a grievance of conscience.

"9. That for the redress of such grievance the following steps are necessary:—

"(1.) That the Church in Convocation or Synod deliberate for the special purpose of devising A PROPER TRIBUNAL for determining all questions of doctrine, and other matters purely spiritual; whether they arise directly in the way of ordinary trial and appeal, or incidentally in proceedings before the temporal courts.

"(2.) That an Act of Parliament be passed for the purpose of making the judgment or the certificate of such tribunal binding on the temporal courts of these realms.

"(3.) That the Acts of Parliament relating to the Privy Council be so amended as to exempt questions of doctrine and other matters purely spiritual from the cognizance of the Privy Council."

It will be observed here, that the objection raised to the Committee of Council is founded on the suppression of the constitutional legislature of the Church, which gives to the Supreme Executive *Court* an *authority* in matters of doctrine that it ought not to possess. It is not, we apprehend, that the compilers of the above resolutions mean to deny the propriety of the State, through its constituted tribunals, taking cognizance of Church causes; but what is objected to is, that the State is permitted

virtually in this way to declare the faith of the Church, because the Church cannot herself speak at all. This is the real evil and danger of our present position. When the Church assented to the regal supremacy in such causes, it was never contemplated that the State would suppress the voice of the Church, and by an arbitrary exercise of power, reduce her Convocations to silence for an hundred and thirty years. It was never supposed that the State would thus deprive the Church of those religious liberties which the law and constitution give her. The State has, we think, no *moral right* to call for the recognition of those powers conferred on it by law, until the Church has been restored to the exercise—the full and unfettered exercise of *her* rights. Let the Church have her Convocation to which she has a legal and constitutional right, of which she has too long been deprived; and then it will not be of much consequence as to the particular shape which the State gives to its supreme tribunal. The Church in Convocation will watch over her own faith.

We have perused in the “Guardian” some letters from Messrs. Allies and Henry Wilberforce on the subject of the authority of the Committee of Council. Mr. Allies says:—

“In the question of Church and State now raised by the Gorham case, a clear view of first principles is so very important, that I venture to address to you a few lines on what appears to me a radical mistake, affecting the whole question, which is contained in your leading article of last Wednesday.

“You observe, ‘It now appears, by the matter-of-fact issue of things, what that Court of Appeal, to which the Church assented at the Reformation, really was. It was a *bona fide* Church Court; not a State Court. It was a Court of ecclesiastics, *appointed indeed by the Crown*, but which, when met, dictated to the Crown; the Crown not professing to judge itself upon doctrine, but accepting the decisions of the ecclesiastics.’

“Neither does the Crown profess to judge itself upon the law of the land, but accepts the decisions of the Courts of Chancery, of Queen’s Bench, of Exchequer, of Common Pleas. Yet are they no less State Courts. Nay, there was a time when the judges of those Courts were ecclesiastics; yet they were no less State Courts then.

“I assert, then, as a proposition self-evident, when stated, to every Churchman, but likewise borne witness to by the principles, the acts, and the position of the Church for eighteen hundred years, that the whole question, whether any particular Court be a Church Court or a State Court, depends upon this one point, *whence it receives its jurisdiction*.

“For instance, the Court of the Dean of Arches is a Spiritual Court, for it receives its jurisdiction from the Archbishop of Canterbury. It matters nothing that the judge is a layman.

“The Court of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a

State Court, because it derives its jurisdiction from the civil power. That the judges actually sitting in it are laymen, matters nothing. If the civil power had commissioned, instead of six laymen, as many bishops, or the whole bench of bishops, to sit as judges, the Court would have been no less a State Court, for the bishops would have sat as commissioners of the civil power, and not in virtue of their inherent right as successors of the Apostles.

“On the other hand, if the Church in synod had commissioned the present six judges of the Privy Council, or any others, to void the question touching Mr. Gorham, it would have been a Church Court.

“So little does the fact, whether the judges are ecclesiastics, matter in principle, that if the Church were to appoint six infidels, were such a thing morally possible, their jurisdiction would be valid.

“Accordingly, the Court of Delegates, appointed by the 28th Henry VIII., was a State Court, for it derived its jurisdiction from the civil and not from the spiritual power. No doubt, the appointment of ecclesiastics did then, and would again, disguise the evil, and the Church is more plainly insulted by the nomination of laymen; but the principle is the same.

“The whole question, therefore, at issue between the Church and the State resolves itself into this,—*Where is the source of spiritual jurisdiction?*

“Let us make it an A B case, discarding the remotest appearance of personalities.

“Surely, then, the source of spiritual jurisdiction all over the earth, whether in England, or France, or Germany, or Russia, or the United States, or Turkey, does not lie in the civil power. Our Lord has not given the keys of the kingdom of heaven to any authority of this world; neither to absolute nor to constitutional monarchs; neither to parliaments nor to democracies; nor to any power compounded of them, or derived from them. Whether the civil authority in a State is exercised by the one or the many, neither the one nor the many have any right to spiritual jurisdiction.”

Mr. Wilberforce argues in the following way:—

“1. The Bishop of London’s measure does not touch the pending Gorham case, but leaves the State to settle that and the questions which it raises, without regard to the fact that they have already been settled by the Church.

“2. For the future, it provides that a new Court shall be constituted by purely state and political authority (for the mention of Convocation is merely the expression of a wish, not a practical proposal), the members of which shall be six Bishops, four theologians, and some lawyers, and that the Court thus constituted shall decide future doctrinal appeals from the Court of the Archbishop.

“I observe, then—

“1. Any Court established merely by Parliamentary authority is a

secular and State Court, though its members may undoubtedly be ecclesiastics. The personal fitness of a judge is one question, the authority by which he sits another. The Committee of Council are (in theological questions) personally unqualified to judge, and also unauthorised by the Church to so. The members of the proposed Court, however they may be held to be personally qualified, will have no higher authority than the Committee of Council. The one is, the other will be, a Court sitting by the authority of an Act of Parliament, and in the name of the Queen, *i. e.* a secular Court.

“2. The personal fitness of the proposed judges is not secured by the Church, but conceded by the State. Queen Elizabeth appointed as Chancellor a mere courtier, Hatton, and Charles II. a political intriguer, Shaftesbury. If the Queen should issue an order in Council binding herself and her successors to appoint none but ‘barristers of five years’ standing,’ the Court of Chancery would not be less a Queen’s Court. At the present moment the good sense of English statesmen is revolted by an arrangement which has set Lords Langdale and Campbell to decide upon the doctrine of baptism; and they propose, in future, to remedy this absurdity by authorising men whom they believe to be personally competent to the task, to decide in the name and in behalf of the State what shall be the doctrine of the Church of England. This is all.

“I have hitherto argued on the supposition that the proposed Court is all that could be desired if it were authorised by the Church; although, if established by the State, as seems to be intended, it will have no authority at all in matters sacred. But I think it may be easily shown that, if the assent of the Church were asked for its establishment, that assent ought to be refused.

“Not to mention several other grave objections, both to the principle and details of the bill; the only authority which, by the laws of the Church, could be superior to that of the Archbishop’s Court is the synod of the Provincial Bishops. For this strictly ecclesiastical body the proposed plan would substitute a court of six Bishops, three lay judges, and four professors. Thus, not merely is a fourth part of the Provincial Synod invested with the authority of the whole, but that part is made a minority in the Court. The plan is wholly uncatholic. But a more serious objection is, that the Gorham case, with all its momentous issues, is left to be decided again by the State, after the Church has determined it.”

Now it will be observed that, in both these passages, the objection raised to the Committee of Council, or to any proposed tribunal to be appointed by the temporal power, is that it is a temporal tribunal, deriving its jurisdiction from the State; and that the position is laid down, that the spiritual power alone has any right to decide in any spiritual causes. Now we cannot go to this length, which is, in our opinion, inconsistent with the general

practice of the Church. We cannot deny to the temporal power the right of interfering, *in a proper way*, with Church questions. We deny that it has the right by itself of deciding controversies of faith; but we maintain that the most Christian sovereign might, with strict propriety, and consistently with Catholic principles, do justice in cases of appeal, even on doctrinal matters, with the advice and judgment of Bishops fairly and honestly chosen; and we think there could be no practical evils worth mentioning in *such* a temporal court, provided the Church were free to legislate and to decide in matters of doctrine. We must be careful lest, in our natural repugnance to the decision of controversies by a secular tribunal, we should take up positions which are untenable. We must be careful not to give our enemies any advantage, by permitting them to wield the authority of canon, and statute, and precedent, against the *principles* we maintain. The following remarks, extracted from Mr. Irons' able, sound, and most timely publication, in which he satisfactorily shows the real meaning and intention of the Church in acknowledging the supremacy of the Crown, will be perused with interest in connexion with this matter:—

“There must, however, be owned to be most serious defects, not only in such a tribunal of appeal as this which is proposed, but in all our Church acts, if we persist in trying to go on, on the *present* theory of the union of Church and State. I am not insensible of the fact, that the ecclesiastical system of England is intimately interwoven with our whole social fabric,—that is in truth, with the most advanced form of civilization which the world has yet seen. It can be no light matter to intermeddle with—it must be done with conscience and caution, but not at hazard: but it cannot remain where it is; and, if we are not alive to this, it will soon become an absurdity.

“Let any one look, for instance, at the canons of the Church; or again, at the fact, that the existence of non-conformity is ignored at one time (as by the law of church-rates, and the forced administration of Church rites to Dissenters); at another time recognized by every kind of legislation. Or, once more, let any one contemplate the fact, that statesmen are hoping to raise, and educate, and keep in order a people, by means of a Church whom they degrade and suspect, and treat as if destitute of conscience, and ask, can this state of things endure? . . . What remedy can be hoped for, for our whole position, until the Church herself shall meet and act in synod?

“For myself, I am free to confess that the overthrow, political or religious, of the Church of England seems to me, when I try to realize it (after I have just risen from the perusal of some revolutionary speech), as the greatest calamity that can befall civilization and Christianity. . . . If such a convulsion is to be saved, it can only be by a thoughtful and voluntary modification of our relations with the State.

The recent reckless defiance of the conscience of the Church, the infatuated oppression of us by the State, has forced on a crisis, which a different treatment by a wise and religious government might have long avoided.

“I suppose every one can see that it is only a question of time, whether the bishops continue in parliament; whether the remains of the royal supremacy be swept away; whether church-rates be abolished; and the like. Woe unto England, if, before these things come to pass, we have not FREEDOM FOR THE CHURCH in synod to manage her doctrines, her ministers, and her property for herself, like all other religious bodies.”—pp. 53, 54.

To attempt any longer to go on maintaining unreformed a system of relations between Church and State, which is each year stimulating the Church to greater and more violent struggles, and which is therefore enabling her enemies, through her weakness, continually to gain more and more upon her, is real infatuation. There *must* be a reform in the relations of Church and State,—such a reform as shall preserve the supremacy of the Crown with the modifications and safeguards which the legislation of 1828 and 1829 render essential. For that reform we must never cease to struggle; and we believe that it is not far distant. Let no one despair of success; because a cause, founded on plain and *obvious justice and common sense*, cannot fail in this day, if urged with unceasing perseverance.

- ART. VIII.—1. *A Speech delivered in the House of Commons on Thursday, May 3, 1849, on the Motion for the Second Reading of Mr. Stuart Wortley's Bill for Altering the Law of Marriage. By ROUNDELL PALMER, Q.C., M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, M.P. for Plymouth.* Oxford: J. H. Parker.
2. *An Examination of the Scriptural Grounds on which the Prohibition against Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister is based. By JOHN DARLING, M.A., Barrister at Law.* London: Rivingtons.
3. *A Summary of the Chief Arguments for and against Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.* London: Houlston and Stoneman.

ALTHOUGH Mr. Stuart Wortley has succeeded this year in pressing forward his measure for the alteration of the Marriage Laws at so early a period of the session, that a very great advantage has been gained by the advocates of that measure, we avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity to record a distinct and energetic protest against an alteration which is calculated to have the most dangerous effects on public morality, and which would place the law of the land in opposition to that which the Church of England believes to be the law of God. Mr. Wortley has endeavoured, to a certain extent, to remove the objections against the measure, as directly interfering with the discipline of the Church of England. We shall hereafter see what value there is in the concession made by the present measure. But we must first advance objections of a more general nature to the proposal.

We have, on a former occasion, stated the grounds on which we entirely concur with those who hold that the marriage of a widower with his deceased wife's sister is forbidden by God's law. In this doctrine it is needless to say, that we are only following the belief of the Church of England herself, since, in the ninety-ninth canon of 1604, she declares as follows:—

“No one shall marry within the degrees *prohibited by the laws of God*, and expressed in a table set forth, *by authority*, in the year of our Lord God 1563. And all marriages so made and contracted shall be adjudged *incestuous* and unlawful, and consequently shall be dissolved, *as void from the beginning*, and the parties so married shall by course of law be *separated*. And the aforesaid table shall be in every Church publicly *set up and fixed* at the charge of the parish.”

Now, it may be very easy for the advocates of Mr. Wortley's Bill to say, that this canon is not legally binding on the laity, and that the Church of England may have been in error in making such statements; but the question is—Has not the Church of England, in the above canon, declared in the most unequivocal manner her belief, that the marriages forbidden by the table of prohibited degrees are “prohibited by the laws of God,” and are “incestuous,” and “void from the beginning?” And, with this declaration patent to all the world, how can the Church of England consent that such marriages should be contracted, or, if contracted, in any way sanctioned, or recognized, or allowed? Can she consent to have any part in what she has declared “incestuous?” Would not any, the very slightest sanction or permission on her part to contract such marriages, or to continue in them, be made, and justly made, an immediate ground of attack upon her, as most grossly inconsistent, or most utterly unprincipled?

We have hitherto, in respect of the Marriage Law, acted on those moral principles which have subsisted even from the earliest ages in the Church, were re-asserted by Archbishops Cranmer, Parker, and all the English Reformers in opposition to Papal laxity and corruption; were continued, as they had always been, in our ecclesiastical laws; were fenced round by repeated Acts of Parliament made at the time of the Reformation; and have continued in full and uninterrupted force and obligation to the present moment.

We are now called on to reverse the laws of the Church and State—not in some matter of mere human regulation, not in some matter of mere external discipline, of changeable rites and ceremonies; but on a point in which God's LAW is at stake—on a point in which the judgment of the Church of England, on a great point of Christian *morality*, is in question.

We must here be permitted to refer to the able arguments of Mr. Roundell Palmer, member for Plymouth, in his speech last year on Mr. Wortley's Bill. The Scriptural argument is thus treated:—

“Now first, to introduce this argument, let us look at the table of prohibited degrees. That table contains *thirty* degrees in all, within which marriage is prohibited; with only *two* of which the right honourable member for Bute now proposes to interfere. Of those thirty degrees, *only fourteen are prohibited in express terms in the Book of Leviticus*; the intermarriages of father and daughter, uncle and niece, and others more remote, both in consanguinity and in affinity, are among those not in terms forbidden; and there are, therefore, *not less than sixteen degrees, a majority of the whole table, including several of*

near consanguinity, which must be abandoned, if those who support the prohibitions are not permitted to argue from something more than the naked, dry letter of Scripture,—if they are not allowed to collect one prohibition from another, to construct a consistent system upon the principles indicated by the instances given in Scripture, and to look to the general tenor and effect of the whole passage of Scripture in which the prohibitions are found. I would ask the House to approach this argument, not in the spirit of sophistry,—

‘I cannot find it ; ’tis not in the bond ;’

but in the spirit of those who wish *bond fide* to look to the law of God, fairly to collect its meaning, and to submit themselves to it fully and implicitly. Before referring to any authorities, I will deal with the text ; and the House will judge whether the argument, on these principles, is not at least sufficiently probable to make them pause before they depart from a rule of interpretation which has been recognized in the legislation of all Christendom down to the present time.

The first point to be considered is, whether the Levitical prohibitions are applicable as a rule for Christians, or only for the Jews. The right honourable gentleman does not (as I understand) dispute that they are generally binding upon Christians as part of the moral law ; his Bill, certainly, does not propose so extensive an alteration of the law as would follow from a denial of this principle, though it is denied by some of his witnesses, and by some of his advocates in this House. As the prohibitions themselves stand in the Book of Leviticus, this point would seem to be free from doubt, because they are introduced by a preamble referring to the practices of heathen nations, which the Jews were not to follow ; and the instances of prohibited marriage, together with a few other practices of a different kind, having been enumerated, all these things are spoken of as abominations and defilements, and causes of penal judgments, not in the Jews, but in the Gentile nations who were not subject to the peculiar Jewish law. Assuming, then, that the prohibitions are moral, and of general application, what are they ? They begin with a general principle thus laid down :—‘None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him :’ and the question is, where that principle is to be limited ? A number of cases are enumerated, some of consanguinity, some of affinity, showing that affinity is here clearly included in the notion of kindred ; and among the enumerated cases there is an express general prohibition of marriage with a brother’s wife. The enumerated cases do not exhaust more than half the instances which the common reason of mankind perceives to fall within the same principle ; the common reason of mankind requires the application under such circumstances of these principles, that the more remote includes the nearer, that equal implies equal, and that the rule laid down as to a man shall govern the converse case of a woman, where the degree of propinquity is exactly the same, and nothing but the sex is different. On these principles of interpretation our table of *prohibited degrees* is founded ; and marriage with a wife’s

sister is held to be prohibited, because it is the exact converse of the marriage, expressly prohibited, with a husband's brother. But the argument from the text of Scripture does not stop here. In the 17th verse of the chapter, a man is expressly forbidden to marry 'a woman and her daughter,' or to take 'her son's daughter or her daughter's daughter;' because '*they are her near kinswomen; it is wickedness.*' It is wickedness, therefore, to marry the *near kinswoman* of a wife; and, for that reason only, marriages with a wife's mother, daughter, or granddaughter (none of which marriages the right honourable gentleman proposes to legalise), are forbidden. But is not a wife's sister her near kinswoman? Does not the common sense of mankind answer that question? Or, if it must be strictly proved that a sister is a near kinswoman in the sense of this passage, look at the 12th and 13th verses, where marriage with a father's sister, or a mother's sister, is prohibited, '*because she is thy father's*' (or, '*thy mother's*') '*near kinswoman.*' If the father's sister is the father's near kinswoman, the wife's sister is the near kinswoman of the wife; and, if it be '*wickedness*' to marry the wife's near kinswoman (as the 17th verse expressly says it is), how can it be otherwise than wickedness to marry the wife's sister?"

The favourite text of the advocates of this measure is thus satisfactorily disposed of:—

"If the passage had ended here, I cannot think any logical reasoner, or any serious Christian, could have entertained a moment's doubt that the prohibitions of this chapter extend to the case of a deceased wife's sister. But it is said that the next verse (the 18th) is in these terms:—'*Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, beside the other, in her lifetime;*' and the argument is, that in this verse the prohibition of marriage with a wife's sister is limited to the wife's lifetime, and that permission to marry a wife's sister after her death is, therefore, implied. I pause for a moment to notice the very unfair way in which it has been continually represented, that the argument *for* the prohibition rests upon this verse. The fact is precisely the contrary:—it is upon this verse, and upon this translation of it, and upon this inference from the verse so translated, that the argument *against* the prohibition entirely and exclusively rests. Take this verse away, and, as I have already shown, this prohibition must of necessity be inferred from the unambiguous language of the previous verses. Before, therefore, we suffer that conclusion to be shaken by any inference from this 18th verse, as it stands translated in the text of our English Bibles, it is not immaterial to inquire whether that translation is certainly correct and free from doubt. When the argument from that verse was lately insisted upon before the Court of Queen's Bench, by parties who then sought to persuade that Court that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was not prohibited by the existing law, Lord Chief Justice Denman made these pertinent observations:—'*If I am to be the judge to pass a judgment upon the meaning of the Scriptures, am I bound by any particular translation of them? That is one of the stumbling-blocks at the very threshold of such an*

inquiry, and we have witnessed the effect of it upon the present occasion. Six different interpretations have been put upon the text of Scripture, as it presents itself to us in the Old Testament.'

"Six different interpretations had been put upon that 18th verse in the discussion before the court of law. I do not, however propose to detain the House by referring to more than one of them; and I refer to that, because it is an interpretation resting, not on any private or conjectural criticism, but on the authority of the translators of the English Bible themselves. Those translators have themselves told us in the margin, that there is room for doubting the accuracy of the version which they have adopted in the text; they have warned us not to rely upon inferences drawn merely from that translation, by telling us in the margin that the verse may with equal propriety be rendered, '*Thou shalt not take one wife to another, to vex her, in her lifetime.*' Adopt that reading, and the verse ceases to bear upon the question now before the House; it refers to the subject of polygamy, and not of incest; and is a prohibition of polygamy under circumstances which tend to the vexation or infraction of the rights of the first wife. That this is the real meaning of the verse was the opinion of Schleusner and of other very considerable Hebrew scholars; and the verse so rendered would correspond in sense with another precept which we find in the book of Exodus, concerning a maid-servant married by her master or her master's son: 'If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish.' The form of expression with which the verse is introduced, and the great preponderance of arguments from probability, appear also to favour this sense; for the reading even in the received text is not, 'Thou shalt not take *her sister to thy wife,*' but, 'Thou shalt not *take a wife* to her sister;' and if polygamy were allowed in all other cases, and marriage with a wife's sister were allowed after her death, it would be difficult to conceive any consistent and satisfactory reason why, among these moral precepts of universal obligation, a marriage with two sisters at once, like that of the patriarch Jacob, should be specially forbidden. Without, therefore, troubling the House with any philological disquisition, I think I have at least stated sufficient ground for the conclusion that a prohibition, clearly and certainly collected from the first seventeen verses of this chapter, cannot safely or reasonably be set aside in favour of an inference drawn from the letter of the 18th verse as it stands translated in the text of the English Bible, but which inference cannot be drawn either from the letter or the spirit of the same verse as it is translated in the margin—an inference which the translators themselves did not draw, because they unquestionably held the Levitical prohibitions to be correctly expounded by the table of prohibited degrees."

It were the merest and most shallow sophistry to compare alterations which time or legislation has introduced into the laws of the Church, on minor points of ceremony and order, with such a question as is now before us. Until the Church of England has

declared in Convocation that she has altered her views on the *religious obligation* of the table of prohibited degrees, it is a most extreme injury to that Church to attempt any alteration in the law. The effect of an alteration, such as is now proposed, would be to place the laws of the land and the laws of the Church in direct collision. The State would say, on the one hand, to the people of England, that they are fully at liberty to contract certain marriages,—that they incur no risk either from God's or man's laws in so doing. The Church, on the contrary, would teach in every parish church throughout the kingdom, that these very marriages were forbidden by God's law. She would be bound to suspend and depose those of her clergy who celebrated such marriages. She would be obliged to refuse to admit persons guilty of them to the sacrament; she would be obliged to consider these unions unhallowed and null, even while they were valid by the laws of the land. She would be obliged to take all measures to separate the guilty parties, under penalty of excommunication, while the laws of the land would forbid such persons to cease their cohabitation, and would compel them by force to continue in their unhallowed union.

There can be no doubt of what the present law of the Church of England is in these respects. Even if the statutes on the subject were all repealed to-morrow, her own laws and canons would suffice to punish severely any clergyman officiating at such marriages, would dissolve such marriages on penalty of excommunication, and would require communion to be refused to those guilty of them. This is the undoubted state of things in the Church of England, irrespective of any statutes whatever. If therefore the Church of England is to retain her laws and rights inviolate in this matter, as the advocates of the measure pretend, no such marriages can possibly take place by the aid of her clergy, or be recognized in any way. Her courts must dissolve them when formed, and she must in every way condemn them. Is the Church of England to be at liberty to do this still? If she is *not* at liberty to do it, her laws are grossly interfered with. She is told that she may *continue* to regard these marriages as "incestuous," and yet she is to be tied up from putting an end to them. She is to be compelled to recognize as valid, marriages which she believes to be contrary to God's law; and—monstrous inconsistency!—by the very Act which so far acknowledges her belief and her laws, that it expressly abstains from sheltering her clergy from the punishment due to them, if they take part in performing such marriages! Now, we would really put it to the ingenious compilers of this Bill, whether they mean to say, that actions which the Church forbids the clergy to take part in as "incestuous"

can possibly, with any shadow of consistency, be permitted to the laity. Are the laity at full liberty to commit incest, while the clergy are to be punished for taking any part in sanctioning it? If the clergy deserve punishment for sanctioning incest, what would the Church *herself* deserve for administering the sacraments to her members guilty of incest, or permitting them to remain in her communion, unless they repent and abstain from their sin? If the courts of the Church are to be interfered with, as this Bill proposes to do, so as to prevent any proceedings to be taken against persons guilty of contracting such incestuous marriages, what is it but to say, that the Church shall take no steps for the purpose of removing sin and scandal from her own communion,—that she shall extend her favour to persons guilty of a gross sin, as if they were innocent? We know that the corrective discipline of the Church has fallen too much into disuse, and that this very circumstance has been one of the commonest arguments against her in the mouths of Dissenters of all kinds; but what new force such an argument must acquire, if almost the only remaining point in which discipline is still in force, and in which some check is interposed to the tide of licentiousness and passion, is forcibly and deliberately broken through by Act of Parliament, overriding and bearing down the religious principles of the Church of England, and at the very moment too that it recognizes the force of those principles!

If the author of this Bill assume the ground that such marriages are perfectly allowable by God's law, and that the Church of England is not in any way committed against them, why do they still leave the clergy subject to penalties for performing marriages which they themselves acknowledge to be perfectly innocent and Christian? If the object be to avoid any interference with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, why are that doctrine and discipline interfered with as regards the *laity*? To say that there is no interference by the present Bill would be most untrue. There is a gross and palpable interference with the Ecclesiastical Courts, and with the ninety-ninth canon. The Church is tied up from vindicating her principles of morality, and is compelled to recognize incestuous marriages. We are not certain, indeed, whether Clergy themselves would not be at liberty to *contract* such marriages, though they could not celebrate them! At all events, we should be placed in the ridiculously inconsistent position of seeing prosecutions of clergy going on for performing incestuous marriages, which, when performed, we were bound to admit and recognize as perfectly proper and legal. We should be seeing clergy refusing the holy sacrament to persons

who were joined in lawful wedlock, on the ground that they were living in incest. Every conscientious clergyman would be placed in this most painful position. He would appear to be acting most tyrannically, and yet he would only be doing his duty. He would be liable to be taxed with disobedience to the laws of the land, when he was acting most righteously.

Mr. Wortley might just as reasonably call on the Church of England at once to license fornication. We affirm that fornication is a sin of inferior guilt to incest. We maintain that adultery is not a greater sin. If the Church of England is to be *required by law* to abstain from all attempts to remove incest from her communion, then we say that, *a fortiori*, she might be required to permit fornication amongst her members, and, *a pari*, adultery. Shall fornication and adultery be unlicensed, when incest is licensed? There seems no adequate reason why this latter sin should be taken up with such special favour, and patronized by the law of the land, while other and lesser sins, of the same genus, are left unprotected.

But to pass on to another branch of the subject. It is admitted that it is desirable to keep up *some* restrictions on marriage. In short, Mr. Wortley and the present advocates of the Bill are quite willing that the law should remain as it is in all respects but one. The opulent and titled personages, for whose relief this measure is pushed forwards, have no views of an *extensive* nature. They are not radical reformers. They do not go to the root of the question, and determine how many of the degrees are prohibited by merely human authority, and attempt to obtain general liberty for *all* who are restrained from the gratification of their wishes. Far from it. Our Reformers, in the present case, have no such large and philanthropic views. Their exertions—their money—their petitions—their solicitors, are all employed for a definite and limited purpose—the *legitimizing of their own bastard issue*! There is a species of *paternal* interest, and of anxiety for family *honour* and respectability in this, that is excessively amusing. Certain men have illegitimate children; they wish to make them cease to be bastards—it is a slur upon them. They subscribe for the purpose, and a Bill is brought into Parliament, which conceals their actual object under an attempt at general legislation. “The feeling of the country is against it.” No matter. “The Church denounces it.” No matter. “The laws of Church and State, from the earliest ages and the Reformation itself, are against it.” No matter. There is money enough to push it on again and again; and by perseverance, it is hoped, it may succeed. We really think the history of the pre-

present Bill is without parallel in the annals of English legislation. A more grossly partial, selfish, and corrupt proceeding we never yet heard of.

Such as it is, however, it does not profess to interfere, beyond the selfish objects of its promoters, with the table of prohibited degrees. That table they wish to remain in force. We all wish so too. We are not yet prepared to see mothers and sons, brothers and sisters, joined in wedlock; so that every one would wish to keep up the table of prohibited degrees. But, if this measure should pass, we cannot see any reason why the alteration should stop there. Precisely the same arguments may be hereafter brought forward in other cases. Persons may contract marriages within other prohibited degrees in large numbers. They are likely to do so if a breach is now made in the table of degrees. It may then be alleged that it is a grievance to have their children illegitimate. Money may, and undoubtedly *will*, be subscribed, and precisely the same kind of agitation will be again attempted. To break through the table in one point is to set the public mind fermenting on the subject of marriage regulations, and no one can tell where inquiry might lead men. It might lead to a great variety of questions, most dangerous to morality and most injurious to domestic peace.

There is another view of the question which is, perhaps, not the least important, in its bearing upon the Church, and the State too. A large portion of the Church is extremely dissatisfied at the present relations of Church and State. It has been deeply disgusted by ecclesiastical appointments, injurious, in its opinion, to the Church's faith. It has been recently offended by the decision of a temporal court on matters of very important doctrine. It has witnessed, with the highest dissatisfaction and distrust, the attempts of the Committee of Council to interfere in the regulation of Church schools, and more than suspects the intention of the State to press an infidel system of education. In the midst of all the ferment and excitement caused by these circumstances, this Bill of Mr. Wortley proposes to subvert the doctrine which the Church of England has always hitherto held on the subject of marriage. It proposes further to narrow and fetter her liberties. It proposes to tie up her hands from punishing vice and immorality. And it does all this in the face of the *admitted* hostility of the great mass of the clergy. Very well—what will be the effect? Let this Bill pass, and it will only add double vigour to the agitation which prevails. It will be another item in the catalogue of wrongs done to the Church by the State. It will be only another argument—and a potent and affecting one—in the hands of those who claim liberty for the

Church, and demand, as a matter of right, that the ecclesiastical legislation of the Church of England shall be released from the unconstitutional and arbitrary power which has so long shackled and silenced it. We know not whether the Government wish to give power to the agitation which has for some time existed in the Church. If they do so, they cannot, we firmly believe, take a more effectual way than by supporting Mr. Wortley's Bill. Measures of this kind will work their own cure before long.

We protest, on behalf of the Church, against the passing of this, or of *any further measures whatever* affecting the Church without the consent of that Church in Convocation. We claim this, as a matter of common justice and constitutional right. The protest of Churchmen on this and similar subjects may be disregarded; it may be thrust aside; it may be treated with contempt. But it will be henceforward repeated again and again, and each blow that is aimed against the Church will only nerve the resolution of men, in the struggle for her liberation from a position of danger and difficulty. Her perplexities all arise from her relations to the State. Could these be adjusted, in accordance with the altered character of the State legislature, all would be quiet again.

We trust that, amidst the great pressure of other novel and more immediately exciting causes of alarm, Churchmen will not permit this bill of Mr. Wortley's to proceed on its course without offering every opposition to it in their power. We hope that petitions against it will not be overlooked; but that as many as possible will be immediately sent to both Houses. It is really a great hardship that people will not let the Church alone. If they go on meddling with it, they will yet repent their folly. They are rousing a spirit which will give them plenty to do. The Church of England has hitherto been passive generally, but a long series of injuries and outrages is beginning to work its effect at length. In that catalogue the present Bill is not the least item: its peculiarly obnoxious nature—its encouragement of vice—its *reward* of perjury, incest, and disobedience to the laws of the land—and its gross selfishness—constitute altogether so odious a compound, that a violation of the rights of the Church and of the laws of God could never have come in a more offensive shape. If the Bill passes, it will have other effects and consequences besides those on public morals; and with this suggestion, respectfully addressed to the various parties interested, we conclude for the present.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. 2. Reverberations. 3. The Heiress in her Minority. 4. Practical Hints on the Reformation of Cathedral Music. 5. The Vegetarian Messenger. 6. Woodward's Sermons. 7. De Havilland's History of Ancient and Modern Rome. 8. Babington's Oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes. 9. Landon's Plain Sermons on the Sacraments and Services of the Church of England. 10. Landon's Ecclesiastical Dictionary. 11. Maskell's Sermons. 12. Doctor Johnson: his religious Life and Death. 13. Thompson's Original Poems. 14. The City of God. 15. Sermons of the late Rev. John Hamilton. 16. The Words from the Cross. By Rev. E. Wilson. 17. Letters on Secession to Rome. By Rev. J. L. Ross.

Poems. By ARTHUR H. CLOUGH.

Bothie of Toper-Na-Fuosich. A Long Vacation Pastoral. ARTHUR HUGH CLOUGH. London: Chapman and Hall.

Strayed Reveller and other Poems. By A. London: Bellowses. 1849.

Age has its own mannerisms of thought and expression, and in literature, and more especially in poetry. Where there is much original genius, this mannerism is not wont to be offensive. There is a good deal of it even in the Elizabethan age: it offends us in "Beaumont and Fletcher," and in "Ben Jonson;" it is sometimes tedious in "Shakspeare;" but it is only perceptible in Shakspeare. In our own days, a certain "transcendental" school has arisen, both in prose and poetry, which has succeeded in gaining no little of the public attention, and which really counts men and women of genius among its chiefs: we name Tennyson, Browning, and Mrs. Browning, late Miss Barrett; further we may add, Carlyle, though we are unwilling to name this mischievous yet brilliant word-monger in such good company. But most of our young poets and poetesses, for some past, have emulated the three first-named in their various

True, we have still a hearty, honest, genial Anglo-Saxon poet in Farquhar Tupper, and other "originals" in "Helen" and Miss Drury, but the general current has set of late in the transcendental direction we have intimated; and here are such authors, who may be said to be "rowing in the same

boat," and struggling with the same rapids. Yet, it would be unfair to confound the pensive but Christian mysticism of Tennyson and of Mrs. Browning, or the dramatic earnestness of that lady's husband, to whom we so recently devoted an article, with the hopeless despondency and vague dreaming of the poets we are now about to treat of. Poets they are, with all their faults and weaknesses; and this is a great word:—and yet, in some sort, poets at second hand; frequently, nay, constantly reminding us of their models and prototypes, or at least of *those*, whom they have so long and so ardently admired, that they unconsciously reflect them in almost all their "inspirations." The "Pastoral Long Vacation," indeed, forms an exception to this rule, and is more like Goethe's "Herrman and Dorothea," than any other poem we are acquainted with; though even here there are some unnatural passages, which read like *bad* bits of "Browning" at *second hand*. Such is the very strained imagery, concerning the "two bridges and the great keystone" (see p. 41), which, from the vile taste of the age, has probably been pronounced and considered by far the finest thing in the whole poem. However, there is some feeling, some humour, some taste, and a good deal of common sense, in this whimsical production. The concluding letter from "Hobbes," respecting marriage, has great merit: we cite a few lines, which appear to us right worthy of note:—

"Rachel we found, as we fled from the daughters of Heth by the desert;

Rachel we met at the well; we came, we saw, we kiss'd her;
 Rachel we serve for long years,—that seem a few days only,
 E'en for the love we have to her,—and win her at last of Laban.
 Is it not *Rachel* we take in our joy from the hand of her father?
 Is it not *Rachel* we lead in the mystical veil from the altar?
Rachel we dream of at night: in the morning, behold, it is Leah.
 Happy and wise who consents to redouble his service to Laban;
 So, fulfilling his week, he may add to the elder the younger;
 Not repudiates Leah, but wins him the Rachel unto her."

"Which things are an allegory," indeed, but a very beautiful allegory, and one which we may safely leave to the application of our readers. But dismissing this said "Bothie of Toper-Na-Fuosich" from our consideration, as a whim, but a whim which only genius could indulge in, we approach the "minor poems" of this same writer, "Arthur Clough," with some little anxiety to discover the real mind of the poet, yet with a good hope that all our doubts may be satisfactorily cleared away. Alas! this hope is not realized; on the contrary, we soon discover that Mr. Clough is professedly in search of a religion, and of an object in life; and

as mere Byronism is altogether out of fashion, and nobody affects the miserable, that we know of, nowadays, for the sake of admiration, we have only to commiserate our author's mental darkness. His poem, however (p. 23), headed "When Israel came out of Egypt," is (as *we* understand it), though it is intentionally obscure, one of the most painful, and, we may add, the most *blasphemous*, we ever remember to have glanced at. Schiller's "Resignation," or "Gods of Greece," was Christian compared to this! The poet starts with deprecating all existing revelation; he says,—

" 'Lo, here is God, and there is God!'
 Believe it not, O man!—
 In such vain sort to this and that
 The ancient heathen ran.
 Though old Religion shake her head
 And say in bitter grief,
 'The day behold, at first foretold,
 Of Atheist unbelief,'—
 Take better part, with manly heart!
 Thine adult spirit can:
 Receive it not! believe it not!
 Believe it *not*, O man!"

This is pretty cool, we think, for an Oxford Tutor. Indeed, we are rather disposed to wonder these poems should not have shared in the holocaust to which the "Nemesis" of Mr. Froude was recently devoted. There is much more in the same strain: we cannot follow this lengthened war-note of audacious misbelief or rather unbelief through all its "changes." Our author informs us, however, that our present scientific knowledge impels us to the conclusion, that "there is no God:"—

"Earth goes by chemic forces; heaven's
 A 'Mécanique Céleste';
 And heart and mind of human kind
 A watch-work as the rest!"

The poet proceeds to inquire whether *this* is a true "voice;" and he certainly *appears* to answer this question in the affirmative. However, he bids us *hope* that some *prophet* may arise, who, from Atheism's self, will hew out *a new religion*: in other words, Mr. Clough swells the modern outcry for the individual anti-Christ, which Carlyle, and Emerson, and "George Sand," and many others have raised before him. There are some more utterances, headed "Blank misgivings of a Creature moving about in worlds not realized," which are utterly joyless and hopeless and lifeless: they remind us much, *not* in matter, but in style, of the blank

verse of Browning's "Paracelsus." Such is the somewhat marvellous fragment." (p. 44.)

"—Roused by importunate knocks,
I rose, I turn'd the key, and let them in.
First one, anon another, and at length
In troops they came; *for how could I, who once
Had let one in, nor look'd him in the face,
Show scruples as again?* So in they came,
A noisy band of revellers,—vain hopes,
Wild fancies, fitful joys; and there they sit
In my heart's holy place, and through the night
Carouse, to leave it when the cold grey dawn
Gleams from the East, to tell me that the time
For watching and for thought bestow'd is gone."

This, both in matter and expression, seems an obvious reminiscence of some of the speeches of the Sage of "Wurzburg." At times, Mr. Clough's mannerism is decidedly offensive; for instance, a vile imitation, or at least reflection of Tennyson's worst parodies, may be observed in the morbid and silly effusion (p. 44) headed "Natura Naturans." We have rarely met with any more grotesquely out of place, than the *ὁ θεὸς μετὰ σοῦ*, which Mr. Clough has given us, as the refrain to his "Farewell, my land lassie!" Such a manifest incongruity is startling. We have been led astray by the remembrance of Byron's appropriate and poetical "Zoe mou, sas agapo?"—We suppose the lines abusing "Duty" (p. 39, 40) are very clever, but more wicked. Mr. Clough, do you feel no compunction of conscience for having given such mischievous rhymes to the world? But we suspect you are not much troubled with this said modicum of conscience. Before we part, however, from this author, let us quote his first and best poem, which reminds us of Tennyson's mighty "Vision of Sin," and which is altogether Tennysonian in scope and treatment, though it has much of its own.

"The human spirits saw I on a day,
Sitting, and looking each a different way:
And, hardly talking, subtly questioning,
Another spirit went around the ring
To each and each: and as he ceased his say,
Each after each, I heard them singly sing,
Some querulously loud, some softly, sadly low,
'We know not,—what avails to know?'
'We know not,—wherefore need we know?'
This answer gave they still unto his suing,
'We know not: let us do as we are doing.'

‘Dost thou not know that these things only seem?’—
 ‘I know not: let me dream my dream.’
 ‘Are dust and ashes fit to make a treasure?’—
 ‘I know not, let me take my pleasure.’
 ‘What shall avail the knowledge thou hast sought?’—
 ‘I know not: let me think my thought.’
 ‘What is the end of strife?’—
 ‘I know not: let me live my life.’
 ‘How many days, or ere thou mean’st to move?’—
 ‘I know not: let me love my love.’
 ‘Were not things old once new?’—
 ‘I know not: let me do as others do.’
 And when the rest were overpast,
 ‘I know not: I will do my duty!’ said the last.”

‘Thy duty do?’ rejoin’d the voice:
 ‘Ah, do it, do it, and rejoice:
 But shalt thou then, when all is done,
 Enjoy a love, embrace a beauty,
 Like *these*, that may be seen and won
 In life, whose course will then be run;
 Or wilt thou be where there is none?’
 ‘I know not: I will do my duty.’”

And taking up the word, around, above, below,
 Some querulously high, some softly, sadly low,
 ‘We know not,’ sang they all, ‘nor ever need we know.’
 ‘We know not,’ sang they; ‘what avails to know?’
 Whereat the questioning spirit, some short space,
 Though unabash’d, stood quiet in his place.
 But as the echoing chorus died away,
 And to their dreams the rest return’d apace,
 By the one spirit I saw him kneeling low,
 And in a silvery whisper heard him say,
 ‘Truly, thou know’st not, and thou need’st not know,
 Hope only, hope thou, and believe alway;
 I also knew not, and I need not know:
 Only with questionings pass I to and fro,
 Perplexing those that sleep, and in their folly
 Imbreeding doubt and sceptic melancholy,
 Till that, their dreams deserting, they with me
 Come all to this true ignorance, and thee.’”

A still more helpless, cheerless doubter is “A.,” author of the *Strayed Reveller*, and other Poems,” whom, for the sake of his author’s memory, we forbear to name more particularly. Yet, not surprised are we, such teaching should have led to such results: by the fruit we know the seed. Any thing more darkly melan-

choly, more painfully sombre, than the last poem in the volume, entitled "Resignation," and addressed to "Fausta," we never remember to have seen. The poet, in the very heyday of his youthful spring, arrives at the conclusion, that all life, whether for ourselves or others' sakes, is vanity. He says (p. 125) :—

"Blame thou not, therefore, him, who dares
Judge vain beforehand human cares ;
Whose natural insight can discern
What through experience others learn :
Who needs not love and power, to know
Love transient, power an unreal show :
Who treads at ease life's uncheer'd ways :—
Him blame not, Fausta, rather praise.

* * *

"Enough, we live :—and if a life,
With large results so little rife,
Though bearable, seem hardly worth
This pomp of worlds, this pain of birth ;
Yet, Fausta,—the mute turf we tread,
The solemn hills around us spread,
This stream that falls incessantly,
The strange-scrawl'd rocks, the lonely sky,—
If I might lend their life a voice,
Seem to bear rather than rejoice.
And even *could* the intemperate prayer
Man iterates, while these forbear,
For movement, for an ampler sphere,
Pierce Fate's impenetrable ear,—
Not milder is the general lot,
Because *our* spirits have forgot,
In action's dizzying eddy whirl'd,
The something that infects the world."

This melancholy is deep indeed. The very first longer poem in the volume, "Mycerinus," is a kind of apotheosis of despair ; it looks as if suggested by a father's fate. At the same time, it seems almost a profession of atheism ! "Emerson," we learn from the sonnet on p. 52, is one of "A.'s" great teachers : a "god of his idolatry." Poor worshipper, with such a god !—The reminiscences of Tennyson and Browning are manifold also in this volume. Thus "A Modern Sappho" (p. 64) is a rather confused imitation, or reminiscence, of one of Browning's "Dramatic Romances," entitled "The Laboratory ;" and a very mystical affair, called "The New Sirens, a Palisade," is more Tennysonian than Tennyson himself. Even the most beautiful poem in the volume, "The Forsaken Merman," reminds us of Tennyson, but

not unpleasantly : it is far superior to *that* poet's "Merman" or "Mermaid;" and, perhaps, equal to any of his lyrical creations. There is a musical cadence in the rhythm almost unrivalled. The same merit will be discovered in the somewhat aimless, yet lyrically beautiful poem, which gives its name to the volume.

Altogether, of these two new poets, "A." is, we think, the superior, being at once the more earnest and the more poetical; but each has real claims. "A's" singing is like the musical wind wailing through the forest tops on the high mountains far away. "Clough" resembles rather the monotonous heaving of the sea against a rock-bound shore. Both are very *sad*; and neither Oxford nor Cambridge need rejoice in their children.

II--1. *Reverberations*. London: John Chapman, Strand. 1849,
2. *Reverberations*. Part II. London. 1849.

CHARLES SWAIN, the reciter of these strains, is possibly known to many of our readers as the frequent occupier of the Poet's corner in country newspapers, and a ladies' album-filler after the most approved fashion. Here he appears in quite a new character (anonymously by the way), as an Emersonian prophet, a transcendental philosopher, a sublime "anythingarian;" and, to tell the plain truth, he has written a vast amount of wordy twaddle in conformity with his new vocation, and said some few, some *very* few, good things. It is singular how this style of writing palls upon one: how inconceivably tiresome it grows, as soon as we discover that the gigantic mountain is bringing forth a mouse. Yet there is much good feeling and honest endeavour in these metrical talkifications. The first three are by far the best; "Balder," "Thor," and "Believe in God." "Balder" *seems* to be suggestive of something very wonderful, if we could only discover it, and is apt to inspire the general reader with a certain amount of *awe*. True, it has no great meaning; or, if it has any meaning, it is a very bad one.

"But the Fates relent not; strong Endeavour,
Courage, noble Feeling, are in vain;
For the Beautiful has gone for ever:
Vain are Courage, Genius, strong Endeavour:
Never comes the Beautiful again."

"Lillibullero!" say we. By the by, none of these transcendental gentlemen understand the simplest elements of *punctuation*: we are compelled to *stop* their effusions, before we can yield them admission to our pages. "Thor" is less poetical, and altogether less striking, yet is not devoid of a certain mystical effect.

“Believe in God” is an almost noble strain: it was by this, which we have seen quoted with its author’s name, that we were enabled to fix the authorship of “Reverberations.” Here Mr. Swain seems to have been frightened by Socialism into something like a Christian mood, though he still makes very bold with God’s truth, and talks of “The hero of our race” in a strain “by no means to be commended.” Still this, if not a poem (it is scarcely *artistic* enough to deserve that appellation), is at all events a manly cheerful utterance, one to which we are glad to award its meed of praise. But O! the dreary strains that follow, the big-mouthed oracular warnings, and lessons, and voices! all the old Socinian commonplace of Channing and his crew, given to us, as some wonderful revelation of novelty! And “Part II.” is worse again: still more wordy, more prosaic, more tame, more pretentious (if possible), more twaddling! Here and there we catch a momentary gleam of sunshine, light reflected from “Tennyson” for the most part: thus “the Lady Alva’s Web” *seems* to have something in it, reminds us for a moment of other and better things, (a strange intermixture of the lady-witch in “Thalaba” and Alford’s “Lady Alice,”) and after all it turns out to be the old dull story. There is next to no “poetry” in these effusions; “Reverberations” they are, no doubt,—faint and hollow echoes of the worthless optimism of the age, shadows of a shade, the commonplace of “the worser half” of the nineteenth century; transmuted into rhymes, almost as dreary, and apparently as interminable, as those of “De Lamartine” himself. Better the honest confession of his own imbecility and weakness, and that of all his school, with which poor Carlyle favours us, than this wordy twaddle about intellectual glory and moral splendour: better despair itself than this futile inanity and childish self-confidence. We scarcely meant to be so severe, but it is better the plain truth should be spoken. These “Reverberations” are “nought.”

III.—*The Heiress in her Minority; or, the Progress of Character.* By the Author of “*Bertha’s Journal*.” 2 vols. Murray.

SEVERAL years have elapsed since the publication of “*Bertha’s Journal* ;” the great popularity of which has justly induced the authoress to offer another work for the benefit and amusement of the present generation. “*The Minority of an Heiress*” will be found as useful as it is interesting to all who seek acquaintance with the phenomena of nature, the gems of history, and the curiosities of art; a large variety of these are here brought together, framed in an agreeable picture of domestic life, and accompanied

by many moral and just observations. The reader must not here expect any romantic adventures, the interest chiefly consisting in the history of a young girl of quick, intelligent powers, and ardent disposition, who, being suddenly thrown into a situation of great trust, power, and difficulty, is gradually taught the means of disciplining her character, and the realities of daily life, by her own good sense and the affectionately wise forbearance of her friends. The want of incident in the story will not be perceived by the many who like to acquire facts without the trouble of seeking them for themselves. The religious information is conducted much in the same way. There is a great deal of useful knowledge conveyed in didactic conversations, interspersed with many moral and a few practical reflections. If, on the one hand, it is not very spiritual teaching; on the other, it is not sentimental.

Many pages are also devoted to the progression of taste in manners and in literature, past and present. In this department especially much of the interest is destroyed by the multiplicity of subjects brought together into a few consecutive pages, which precludes the possibility of working out any *one* idea, and frequently renders the conversations flat. Nor is it true to nature; for in real life, even where we do but lay a passing touch on a subject, yet each is dwelt on sufficiently to bear its quantum of interest, expressed or understood, enough to make social intercourse a *reality* of feeling and intelligence, and not a painted canvass of imitative superficiality.

It is ever tiresome to find fault: let us rather indulge ourselves in pointing out the more peculiar merits of this work, on which, it is evident, much labour and care have been bestowed. Among other merits, it has that of self-evident truth in the portraying of the Irish character; and we would much recommend those chapters where the heiress, Evelyn O'Brien, comes into personal contact with her tenantry. We must forbear quoting any of these scenes, as we had wished to do—to be understood, they must be read with the context—and there they will be found really interesting in connexion with the histories of the poor families on her estate, and with the mistakes and misunderstandings which arise from Evelyn's eagerness to do good, and her ignorance of the means of doing it. We heartily wish that a few more of the Irish proprietors were as well fitted to guide and assist their poor neighbours as this youthful heiress; indeed, there are few, though older and apparently wiser, at this time in Ireland, who might not learn from this book the principles and practice derived from the experience of a calm-judging and right-feeling mind, balanced by a thorough knowledge of the Irish

character and the history of the nation ; without which no arguments can prevail, nor advice assist, among a misguided and bigoted, but affectionate and fiery people.

We quote one little anecdote, recounting the judicious efforts of two ladies to benefit their poor neighbours by encouraging their own industry :—

“ Some young ladies, who went to reside near the sea-side in another part of Ireland, found that, among numerous applications for charity, the greatest number were from the families of fishermen. On inquiring into the cause of their poverty, it was found that some had bad worn-out nets, nearly good for nothing ; and, having large families to support, they were too poor to buy new ones, so that even in the most favourable weather they could earn but little ; the old fishermen too, no longer able to take their part in their daily calling, and having no employment by which they could support themselves, were a burden on those to whom they belonged, and the consequent distress was at times severe. These young ladies, not having much experience, sent to a neighbouring sea-port for several nets, on which they laid out a good deal of money ; but the person they employed to procure them bought half-worn nets, which soon became bad. In a short time the poor fishermen had to complain again that half their time was spent in mending them ; so these excellent and now more prudent ladies thought of a better scheme—one which would ensure good nets, and give employment to three different sets of people.

“ ‘ Pray tell it then exactly,’ said Evelyn ; ‘ perhaps in some way I might imitate them.’

“ ‘ They bought raw hemp—I mean, not spun—and employed the poor women in their neighbourhood to spin it into strong yarn, fit for the sort of twine of which fishing-nets are made ; it was then twisted into twine of two or three strands, according to the kind required ; but they had some trouble before the women learned to do all this in the proper way. When it was all rightly prepared, the old fishermen were employed to make it into nets, which they all knew how to do. I have frequently seen them netting with a very coarse needle filled with twine, and using their thumb, to form the stitch, instead of a netting-pin. At length the new nets were made, and the young ladies sold them at a very moderate price to those who wanted them, receiving the payment in small instalments.’

“ ‘ Sold them !’ exclaimed Evelyn ; ‘ oh, how shabby and paltry !’

“ ‘ Stop, my dear ; do not judge too quickly. One good *take* of fish with the new nets would have enabled the fishermen to pay the full price at once ; but they only paid it by instalments, which was, you will allow, a very great relief to such poor people : and, as to selling them, I assure you that experience has shown that the poor value much more what they pay for than what they receive as charity, and take care of it accordingly.’

“ ‘ Well ; and how has the business gone on ?’

“ ‘ Exceedingly well. The nets, being made of good homespun hemp, are remarkably strong, and their excellence is so well known now, that all the neighbouring fishermen are glad to buy them at their full price, so there is a constant, well-established manufacture and traffic going on: the women spin, the old men net and support themselves, the fishermen buy, and, no longer deceived by unsound nets, have their excellent fish always ready for their customers. Thus, you see, those young ladies, by combining their charity with prudence, have the delightful and lasting gratification of having preserved numbers of industrious people from distress by ensuring to them the means of pursuing their healthy and honest vocations. They are amply repaid by those feelings for their risk and exertions, which were known only to a few friends, ultimately costing them but little, and all effected without the smallest ostentation.’ ”—Vol. i. pp. 423—425.

There is, in chapters xxx. and xxxii., a pleasant account of the effect on the social intercourse of the country-people of the rebellion of 1798, of the anxieties and excitement among the gentry in the disaffected parts, and some amusing anecdotes of their ingenuity in defending themselves. We must quote one little *ruse de guerre*:—

“ ‘ I must first tell you that my father was a clergyman, and resided at a small village not many miles from the place where that action was fought. All the military quartered there and in the neighbourhood were called out early on that morning, as well as the yeomanry corps, led by their captain, who was the principal person in the village, and a magistrate. Many of the inhabitants followed, well armed, to join, with their loyal though perhaps unskilful bravery, in defence of their property and of the common cause. Much depended on the issue of this battle; if the rebels were victorious, they would probably march direct to that little village, to seize upon a large store of arms and ammunition deposited there. But, Evelyn, while all the able-bodied men were thus marched off, what was to become of these stores, which would have been an easy prey to any straggling parties of the enemy? In the centre of the village, which stood on a hill, four high roads met, and there a field-piece had been placed; a few old men established themselves round it as a guard, and they were headed by the vicar, my dear father, the most mild and peaceful of men! My sister, who was then a child, enjoyed the novelty of the scene, though catching a little of the general alarm; and you would be amused at the vivacity with which she describes the singular group assembled under our venerable father as a garrison for the village. In order to give a martial appearance to his little regiments of ancients, when seen from the neighbouring hills, all the old caps, red jackets, and waiscoats of the militia and yeomanry, and even the women's red petticoats, were put in requisition; and such was the effect of this skilful stratagem, that some of the flying parties from the battle, who

were approaching, were seen to pause, and then to cross over into another line of road. On these occasions, swords and muskets, and even polished spits and pokers, were made gleam in the sun whenever my father gave the signal, by brandishing his long bright telescope.”—
Vol. i. p. 243.

Most of our English readers will probably be interested in an account of the formation of the bogs, which occupy so large a portion of the country, and are in themselves so curious and interesting, and about which some very singular discoveries have lately been made:—

“As their path skirted it for some way, Evelyn’s attention was directed by her father to the variations of the soils, which were marked by the different wild plants. On the most solid part of the bog heath grew in profusion, with sometimes a few furze-bushes intermixed; while on the damp edges of the path were sedge-grass and rushes; the beautiful *pingucula* showing here and there in purple tufts. He then pointed to many wet patches, where bright green moss appeared thickly spread over the surface, and, gathering a specimen of it, gave it to Mabel to put in her botanical case.

“‘That soft green mossy place looks very different from this on which we are walking,’ said Evelyn.

“‘Yes: but they are both called bog,’ said Mr. Desmond. ‘The name is given indiscriminately to very different kinds of substances; it always implies, however, something loose and infirm, a soft earthy substance: it is an Irish word which signifies shaky or trembling. In that mossy part the water is pent up near the surface, and renders it so soft, that if you attempted to walk there you would sink. On the other hand, those parts that have been either naturally or artificially drained become, as you see, more dry and solid; and in that state bog may more justly be termed peat.’

“‘You told me, papa, that bog is said to be formed of decayed trees and other vegetable substances,’ said Evelyn.

“‘Yes, that seems to be the general impression,’ he replied, ‘and with good reason, I think; for it is well known that formerly extensive woods stood in the very places now occupied by bogs, both in this country and Great Britain, as well as on the Continent; indeed, I have heard of some instances where the trees that formerly stood there are still remembered by old people: and in many of our bogs the stems and roots of large trees are found at a great depth beneath the surface, which seems to confirm that opinion.’

“‘But what threw down the trees, papa?’

“‘Some one of the many accidental causes by which nature seems to work—a deposit of sand, washed down from the hills, may have formed a barrier or dam across the stream which conveyed it; fallen leaves, broken twigs, and fresh materials from the higher grounds, increase the barrier; and large pools of stagnant water being thus formed, the soil in which the trees stand becomes soft and loose, the roots gradually

decay, and at length, easily yielding to the force of the winds, the trees themselves fall, adding immediate weight and solidity to the mass.'

" 'It seems extraordinary,' said Mr. Stanley, 'that there should have been formerly such extensive forests in a country where nothing but bog now appears.'

" 'Yes,' but you remember Spenser says—

" 'Of woods and forests which therein abound,'

replied Mr. Desmond. 'The face of the country has indeed changed; but observe, I do not confine the formation of bog to the fall of forests only, for many shallow bogs are to be found on the steep sides of our mountains, where it is not probable that thick woods ever stood, and where it is not possible that pools and stagnant waters could have ever existed. The humidity of our climate encourages the rapid growth of several plants, which I shall presently have an opportunity of showing you, and which seems to be an essential part of all bogs. But in the mean time I wish to mention a fact worth your observation. It is—that pieces of the bark of trees are often found, undecayed, in the substance of the peat; their structure and fibrous appearance being so distinct in the inner rind, that the very species of tree to which they belonged can be easily distinguished and I will add, that the peculiar character of each bog may be traced, by observing the remains of the different plants of which it was chiefly composed.'

" 'I wish you would show me an instance,' said Mr. Stanley.

" 'Most willingly,' Mr. Desmond replied, leading them towards a party of men who were cutting a drain. 'In the first place,' said he, 'you may observe the evident remains of heath in some places; but now, compare those scraps to which I point with my stick, with the thick tufts of soft green moss that I showed you on the wet, impassable bog. Mabel, have you the specimen I gave you?'

" 'Yes, papa, here it is; and here are also specimens that Gerald and I gathered of the conferva and the pretty little water ranunculus.'

" 'Oh! as to that ranunculus aquatica, it contributes as much as any plant to the formation of bog. Growing very rapidly, it will in one summer spread over the whole surface of the water in which it is found, and, its stems being all matted together, it drops in winter to the bottom. The following summer a new layer spreads over the surface, and then subsides in the same manner, and so on year after year; so that this plant alone in a very few years, by accumulating from the bottom, decaying, and becoming mixed up with earthy particles, almost forms a bog in itself. The same may be said of this conferva, so common in water. But the sphagnum, the most abundant of all the plants which tend to produce bog, and which flourishes equally in damp ground or in water, and in every region, assists in the formation of bog more than any other plant, in consequence of its peculiar habits. Some mosses grow only in shady places, others prevail in meadows, and the various aquatic plants require different soils; while the sphagnum is found every where.'

“ ‘I should like to know that peculiar habit of the sphagnum to which you allude,’ said Mr. Stanley.

“ ‘It is this:—its seed-vessel has no foot-stalk, like that which you may have observed in all other mosses, where the pretty little cups, supported on slender threads, scatter their seeds around ; but, in the sphagnum, the seed-vessel continues always close to the tuft of leaves in which it was formed ; the seeds vegetate among those leaves, and thus spread a new bed over its last year’s withered layer. The young plants, in due course, produce their seed and wither in their turn ; and the same process thus continually taking place, layer upon layer is formed, which, acting like a wet sponge, presses down the old layers by its weight, and forms, at length, a compact mass of decaying vegetable matter.’

“ ‘I have heard of your bog-oak and bog-wood, which are, I suppose, the same thing,’ said Mr. Stanley.

“ ‘No,’ replied Mr. Desmond ; ‘the pine, of which more is found than of any other tree, is usually termed bog-wood ; and it is a curious circumstance, that it retains so much of its resinous nature as to make it an admirable fire-wood. It is indeed a treasure to the poor in the neighbourhood of those bogs where it is found ; for, while the turf supplies fuel, the bog-wood gives so good a light, that splinters of it are an excellent substitute for candles. But this wood has another valuable property ; the tanning process it receives, during its long immersion in the bog, shields it from decay, and it becomes therefore a favourite material with the poor for the rafters of their houses, and still more for their gate-posts. You know common gate-posts, though ever so well painted, decay at the surface of the ground ; whereas posts of bog-wood defy alike both drought and moisture.’

“ ‘You said in the bogs where the pine is found. Is it not found in all bogs, papa?’ Evelyn asked.

“ ‘No, my dear ; it is a curious fact that neither pine nor yew are ever found in the same place with oak. The oak is always in black bogs ; the pine and yew in red bogs.’

“ ‘I suppose,’ said Mr. Stanley, ‘that, being formed chiefly of oak, the bog becomes black from the effect of that acid which exists in oak, and produces ink when combined with iron.’

“ ‘Very probably,’ replied Mr. Desmond. ‘There is certainly a great difference between various bogs, which I attribute to the preponderance of one or other tree or plant in their formation.’

“ ‘The finding of that bog-timber is, of course, a mere chance,’ said Mr. Stanley.

“ ‘The manner of discovering it is remarkable,’ said Mr. Desmond. ‘As the dew never lies on those places beneath which trees are buried, a man goes out early in the morning before the dew evaporates, taking with him a long slender spear. Thrusting this down wherever the absence of dew indicates timber, he discovers, by the touch of the spear, whether it be decayed or sound ; if sound, he marks the spot, and at his leisure proceeds to dig up his prize ; and in doing so he may some-

times happen to discover other curious remains of former times.'"—Vol. i. pp. 111—117.

We wish that we had room for a chapter on the by-gone Knighthood of Ireland, which would interest all our readers; and for several chapters on Irish antiquities, such as the Phœnician remains, vol. i. p. 51,—the yet unaccounted-for peculiarity of Ireland, her Round Towers, p. 79,—the numerous *raths* and *cromleachs*, pillars, and circles of stones, pp. 280 and 298, 303; concerning all of which there is a great deal that is excellent in learning and research, adapted not only to the understandings of the young people to whom the book is chiefly addressed, but containing instruction for many older heads.

We have not time to point out to our readers more of the many pleasing and instructive portions of these volumes; but such passages will not be difficult to find; and we are satisfied that no one can peruse them without feeling present interest, and deriving lasting improvement.

IV.—*Practical Remarks on the Reformation of Cathedral Music.*
London: Rivingtons. 1849.

THIS is a *brochure* not more seasonable than earnest and practical: written, too, by one manifestly master of his subject.

It is notorious that “a dislike to cathedral service” is harboured by many persons, of whom it can no more be predicated that they labour under a distaste for music, than that they are indevout or generally under the influence of Puritan prejudices. To what, then, is this to be ascribed?—to “cathedral service,” in its essence or its accident? Such persons complain of distraction. To what is this due?—to anything that of necessity belongs to choral service, or to certain modern innovations upon it, certain “indecent levities” (to use Bishop Gibson’s expression) which have so generally crept into its performance, that people suppose them (and what wonder?) to be essential characteristics of that glorious arrangement which was published under direction of Cranmer, who in this, as in other matters, aimed, in opposition to Romish corruptions, to restore us to the simplicity and solemnity of the primitive worship? It is needless to indicate which side of this alternative the author espouses. Accordingly, the object of his work is to “state plainly the grounds of uneasiness” felt by such persons as we have spoken of, “so far as they can be definitely assigned and ascertained; so that, if possible, practicable, and really desirable, they may be removed.”

The following is an enumeration of “the points in detail which

have been most commonly and urgently spoken of as deserving, at least, of investigation :”—

“ I.—The practical exclusion of the congregation from their privilege of joining in the Psalms and Responses of Divine Worship, and the practical assumption by the choir of the office of substitute for, instead of leader of, the people.

“ Which is brought about by—

“ 1. The adoption of the theory that the choir *ought* to be the representative of the people.

“ 2. The arrangement of the harmonies, so that the melody is in the treble part only.

“ 3. The high pitch often adopted for the melody.

“ 4. The want of due care in the recitation of the words by the choir.

“ 5. The use of airy ‘ chants.’

“ 6. The substitution of services for chants for the Canticles.

“ II.—The adoption of a sing-song whine, or lugubrious drone, in the minister’s recitation.

“ III.—The introduction of a secular, in the place of a sacred, style of music. Including under this head—

“ 1. Anthems.—In particular,

“ a. The adoption of the music of Mozart, Haydn, and their followers, for anthems, especially their mass music from the modern use of the Church of Rome in some places.

“ b. The use of choruses, &c., from semi-operatic oratorios.

“ c. The use of (so-called) anthems of a school utterly wanting in the characteristics of solemnity and sublimity.

“ 2. Chants and services :—

“ a. The substitution of airy sing-song chants for sober chants of recitation.

“ b. The substitution of services in the place of plain chants for the Canticles ; and the use of services unfit for the purpose they are intended to subserve.

“ 3. Voluntaries.—The use of secular exhibitional voluntaries.”—
pp. 13, 14.

In considering the first of the six causes assigned to the first head, the author is at issue with a great authority on such matters, the Rev. J. Jebb in his book on the Choral Service ; with whom, however, he seems to agree in most respects. We must own to a coincidence of view with this writer, both in regard of general concurrence and the particular exception—if such be Mr. Jebb’s theory ; but we have not his admirable work at hand to refer to. However, by whomsoever broached, we feel it to be our duty energetically to protest against any such theory as that “ the choir *ought* to represent the congregation, as far as the audible portion of the service is concerned.” In the words of the writer before us :—

"It is gravely objectionable. For while it is undoubtedly true that in most cathedrals the choir does, at this time, practically represent the congregation (for the latter are—unwillingly and of compulsion, as we believe—too generally silent); we are yet wholly at a loss to discover any justification of this practice in the formularies of the Church, or in any authoritative document whatever; and certainly we are aware of no elements of advantage of any kind which appertain to it.

"On the contrary, we are persuaded that it is opposed both to the usage of the Church previously to Romanist innovation, and to the view and intention of our reformed Church, as distinctly inferrible from her fabrics and canons; fully as much as it is opposed to common sense, and devoid to the perception of, we think we may say, most persons, of devotional and edifying effect."—p. 15.

Silence on the part of the congregation has, in effect, come to be the rule, not, alas! the exception; and this, whether in cathedrals or in parish churches which affect a choral service. Unfortunately it cannot be said that *these* are the *only* churches in which the congregation fail to take their due share in the service. It is too much the case in those where no such excuse can be alleged. There of course we must seek for other causes. We must remember the coldness and formalism of the bygone century. We must trace in it the congregational development of that spirit, which in the minister has resulted in the pompous preaching of the prayers, and the *via-media* kneeling-box between the clerk and pulpit. But, be this as it may, the congregational silence in "places where they sing," is undoubtedly owing to several of the causes assigned above. For that of which we have already spoken, three remedies are suggested in the pamphlet before us. The one approved, as "most practicable, profitable, and in accordance with the intention of the Church," is, that the congregational chanting "should consist of the predominant melody or plain chant by the congregation in unisons (or octaves rather), and, if desired, the subordinate accompaniment of the choral harmony by the choir or organ." Our own opinion, based upon the experience of several years in congregations of various characters, is, both that this accompaniment must be kept decidedly "subordinate;" and that,—whatever we may be able to accomplish after a while—it is vain to expect, in the present state of knowledge of Church music, congregations to do their part, so long as Psalms, Canticles, and Preces are sung in full harmony. They must be chanted in unison, else we get confused. And that this, whatever musicians may tell us about the effect of consecutive octaves, was what our Reformers intended, Mr. Dyce has shown good cause for believing.

We cannot follow the writer through all his "Remarks," but we would call special attention to the "fourth cause" of the matter complained of, viz.—"*the want of due care in chanting by the choir.*" Gabbling over the recitative portions, so as to allow time neither for the just pronounciation of syllables, nor for attention to stops; stopping on the last word, and drawling out the inflected notes:—these are amongst the commonest as well as most vicious faults of choirs. We entirely and heartily concur in the following sentiments:—

"Constant attention to the sense, to the rhythmical, grammatical, and rhetorical pauses; continued practice and instruction by an intelligent and painstaking precentor; above all, a due regard to the awful nature of the service in which they are engaged, reciting or chanting it as if they both understood and felt it: these only can succeed in producing the desired result; these only can impress it upon the congregation that the service is not merely formal and exhibitional; these only can make the choir to lead the congregation, and these only can induce the latter to follow as the choir lead."—p. 29.

Several pages are devoted to a disquisition on the uses of the words *say*, *read*, *sing*, in the Rubrics, Acts of Uniformity, Injunctions, &c.; the modern sense differing from that originally attached to them; whereas "it is evident that they are not only not used invariably as opposed to each other, but were often applied indifferently, and sometimes convertibly, in speaking of the same thing." And in the older service-books "we find precisely the same kind of application of *dico*, *lego*, *canto*, and *cano*. The solution of all difficulty on this point," the writer continues, "will be found in the fact, that previously to, and at the time of the Reformation, there was an established mode of performing *each* particular part of the service; and that the musical notation adopted by Cranmer and Merbecke was adapted and reformed from them. There was one kind of plain song for reading or reciting prayers, which was upon one sustained tone throughout; another for reading Scripture, which was similarly upon one tone, but with inflections, or 'accents,' corresponding to the grammatical stops; a third kind, for such parts of the offices as were chanted antiphonally; another for anthems, &c.; and, lastly, one for metrical hymns." He presently continues:—

"The inference, then, which we draw from the diverse application of the word *dico* is, that it was used in the Latin Service as a general term applied indifferently to denote the performance of any whatever portion of the Service, according to the accustomed method which belonged to it. And, similarly, the corresponding word *say* was adopted in the English as a general term, applied to denote the performance of any whatever

particular portion of the Service, according to that accustomed, *but reformed*, method which was arranged to belong to it. And this, without any reference to whether *distinctively* that mode of performance might not with propriety be denominated saying, or reading, or reciting, or chanting, or singing. So the Rubric—'The Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, daily to be *said and used* throughout the Year,'—is the general Rubric under which are many directions for particular portions of the Service to be '*sung or said*.' As under *dico* we find the particular expressions '*dicere cum nota*,' '*dicere sine nota*,' &c. We conclude, therefore, that the word *sing* may be applied without necessarily signifying any elaborate degree of singing, &c. On the other hand, that there is nothing in the use of the word *say* to prohibit the continued use of the plain chant arranged by Cranmer and Merbecke." —pp. 32—37.

We could with pleasure cite much more from this pamphlet, did our space permit. We must, however, content ourselves with recommending it to the attentive consideration of all interested in the subject—a subject most closely connected with the glory of God and the edification of man.

v.—*The Vegetarian Messenger; a Quarterly Magazine, designed to aid in the extensive diffusion of true principles in relation to the food of man; advocating total abstinence from the flesh of animals, and the adoption of Vegetarian habits of Diet, as prescribed by the nature of the human constitution, and consequently most conducive to the full development and healthful exercise of the physical, intellectual, and moral powers.* Manchester: Abel Heywood. London: William Horsell. Part I.

STARK nonsense from beginning to end, making assertions which are untrue, and recommending a course which, when long persevered in, has been proved pernicious. As a specimen of the style of argument, it may be mentioned, that they tell us that "most obstinate scurvy has often been cured by vegetable diet:" and *therefore*, they would have us infer, vegetable diet must be wholesome for those who are not attacked with scurvy! Why not set the example of living upon sarsaparilla and senna? delightful meal—sarsaparilla pudding! refreshing beverage—senna beer!

Infinite Wisdom said to the Apostle, "Peter, kill and eat;" words which, we apprehend, must outweigh all vegetarian newspapers, even in these days of religious fanaticism. We recommend the proprietors of this magazine to remove their press to Nauvoo or California.

VI.—*Sermons preached in St. Stephen's Chapel, Dublin. By FRANCIS B. WOODWARD, M.A., Chaplain.* London: Rivingtons.

THESE discourses were evidently addressed to a highly intelligent and educated congregation, fitted to enter into the merits of theological argument. We have seldom met such clearly reasoned discourses as those before us. Their style is simple and unaffected, terse and logical, abounding in divisions, and the argument goes right a-head to the point to be proved. Of what is generally understood by eloquence and oratory, there is none to be found. Clear, vigorous good sense, acute observation, pointed remarks, and (though last not least) sound doctrine, constitute the characteristic merits of Mr. Woodward's volume. All that we have read of it we have read with pleasure and interest. It is really refreshing to meet with such writing as this:—

“I. First then, with regard to the doctrine of God's inward working: ‘it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.’

“I shall commence with two general observations.

“1. God's inward working is not inconsistent with our freedom. What God works in us is to *will*, and, as a consequence of willing, to *do*; but the willing and doing are *our own*. We are not mere machines, or passive instruments in God's hands. A machine or instrument can have no *will*. In short, to *will*, and in consequence, to *do*, is to be free; and, therefore, God's working in us to will and to do, so far from being incompatible with our freedom, is, in fact, working in us to exercise our freedom. *How* this can be we know not,—perhaps no created intelligence can understand it, but it is manifest that what I have stated is the case. If the essence of freedom consist in *willing*, and in consequence of willing, *doing*, it is, I say, manifest that God's working in us to will and to do does not nullify or encroach upon our freedom: He worketh in us, as I have said, to exercise our freedom.

“2. The other general observation I have to make is this: God's working in us to *do* is dependent on, or rather, resolves itself into, His working in us to *will*. Doing is, in fact, the will in action. What we call moral strength, whereby we act, is nothing but the steadiness of the will up to the moment of acting. If the will continue firm, the action is done; while, if the action be not done, it is because the resolution has given way. This is quite manifest, because we can do nothing contrary to our own will. In a popular sense, indeed, people are said sometimes to do things against their will: but this means, against their general inclination; not against their will at the moment of action. In this, the strict sense, the thing is impossible; for before we do any thing, however we dislike it, we must first resolve to do it. But if this be so, if our actions must obey the mandates of the will, then the difference

between the man who does what he resolves on, and the man who does not, is simply, that the one continues unshaken in his resolve up to the decisive moment of action; while the other has vacillated and changed his purpose; the one has had a stedfast will, the other an unstedfast one. The moral strength, then, exhibited in the one case, and wanting in the other, consists simply in this stedfastness of will carried on into, and resulting in, the action resolved on. Whatever, therefore, gives this stedfastness,—that is, whatever keeps the will firm and unbending up to the decisive point,—this communicates moral strength; and, therefore, God, in thus sustaining the will, worketh in us to do of His good pleasure.”—pp. 2, 4,

Mr. Woodward's volume is, very distinctly, an assertion of definite and practical views of Christianity, in opposition to that vague and monotonous assertion of the doctrine of justification by faith, which virtually sets aside, as unchristian, the necessity of sanctification.

VII.—*An Outline of the History of Ancient and Modern Rome, comprising an Account of Italy from its most remote antiquity to the Present Time, and embodying the History of Christianity from its earliest date. In Question and Answer. By Mrs. CHARLES DE HAVILLAND. Second Edition. London: Houlston and Stoneman.*

A VAST amount of really valuable information is condensed in this work, especially in that portion of it which treats of the Modern (that is, the comparatively Modern) History of Rome, from the date of the fall of the Roman Empire. The authoress is a strong and *unrelenting* adversary of Romanism and the Church of Rome; but in such days as the present even this excess of zeal seems pardonable, when contrasted with the predilections of certain of our Church's children. On the whole, we should conceive that the “Outline” before us was likely to be exceedingly popular with “stout Protestants;” so much so, indeed, as to sell its thousands, perhaps, tens of thousands, in course of time. We do not like the preface as well as the body of the work; it is carelessly written in parts, and should be revised, if not altogether removed from the next edition.

VIII.—ΥΠΕΡΙΔΗΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ. *The Oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes, respecting the Treasure of Harpalus, &c. By CHURCHILL BABINGTON, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: J. W. Parker; Cambridge: Deighton; Oxford: Parker.*

THE recovery of the Oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes

is amongst the most interesting literary events of the present age. This long-lost work has turned up at last, where one would not exactly have expected to meet it. It has tumbled out of some mummy-case in Egypt, and has luckily fallen into the hands of persons who were able to appreciate its value. We have the following very interesting account of the discovery:—

“ With respect to the discovery of the MS., our information on this point is derived from N. C. Harris, Esq., of Alexandria. In a paper entitled *Description of a Greek MS. found at Thebes*, which was read before the Royal Society of Literature (Jan. 13, 1848), and has since been printed in their transactions (vol. iii. new series), Mr. Harris says, ‘ When inquiring at Thebes last summer for Tahidic fragments, some broken Greek papyri were shown to me for sale, and I purchased them. One of them is remarkable, and will prove to be of great interest to the lovers of classical literature.’ ”

It appears that Mr. Harris purchased the fragments of the papyrus containing the Oration of Hyperides from a dealer of antiquities at Thebes, in Upper Egypt, in 1847. He subsequently endeavoured to discover the spot from which the MS. was taken by the Arab excavators, but ineffectually. The minutes of the Royal Society of Literature observe, that this MS. is unique among the contents of the Theban tombs, and it suggests the probability that the present discovery may be followed hereafter by the discovery of other portions of the lost writings of antiquity, inasmuch as it appears to have been customary for philosophers and literary men to flock from Greece and Rome to the banks of the Nile, and writings were sometimes buried with the dead.

We have a very accurate account of this curious relic, which appears to have been written on a long roll of papyrus, in successive pages with margins, the length of the whole page being about twelve inches and a half. There are no capital letters, contractions, stops, breathings, accents, or other marks in the whole. As to the age of this manuscript, it is difficult to speak with certainty. The form of the characters resembles those in the oldest manuscripts we possess, such as the Codex Cottonianus and the Codex Alexandrinus, both of which are supposed to be as old as the fifth century. The Codex Frederico Augustanus, which is of the fourth century, agrees still better with it. The Codex Bankesianus of Homer, discovered in Upper Egypt, and supposed to be of the *third* century, resembles it even more. A papyrus found at Herculaneum, and which cannot be therefore of later date than the first century, is very like our MS; and even a papyrus referred to the third century *before* Christ, corresponds to a great extent with it. On the whole, Mr. Babington

leaves the reader to form his own opinion. He states that there is nothing to lead us to the belief that it was written later than the Christian era, though it was probably later than the time of Hyperides. He leaves the reader to judge whether it may not be as old as the third century before Christ. Might it be allowed to hazard a passing conjecture that it may possibly have been buried in the tomb of Hyperides himself—that the Grecian orator may have passed his last days at Thebes? We have not time to examine whether such a notion is tenable; but these strange discoveries set the imagination roving. Mr. Babington has executed his work with the greatest possible care, and with great judgment, as far as we can see. We think a man who has been engaged in such a work as this is really a subject for envy. The fac-similes are beautifully finished.

IX.—*Plain Sermons on the Holy Sacraments and Services of the Church of England.* By the Rev. BENJAMIN WILSON, B.A. London: Rivingtons.

THESE Sermons are sound in doctrine, and earnest, simple, and affectionate in tone. They are more like what is suited to the common people than any discourses we have seen for a long time. The preacher has studied to be intelligible, and he has succeeded. On the whole, we think this a really good volume of sermons for an uneducated congregation, and one which requires to be taught the first elements of Churchmanship.

X.—*A New General Ecclesiastical Dictionary.* By the Rev. EDWARD H. LANDON, M.A., *Author of a Manual of Councils.* Vol. I. London: Rivingtons.

If this work should be continued with the care, accuracy, and research which characterizes the volume before us, we confidently say, that a more valuable work on theological topics will not exist in the English language. Mr. Landon has begun admirably, and he is supplying a want which is most extensively felt. It will be a great benefit to the Church to be relieved from the necessity of referring continually to Ferraris, and other works composed by persons of different communions, and whose teaching must be more or less unsound. The volume before us contains an immense variety of information, and, in all cases, *references to authorities* are appended. A more unpretending and more useful volume we do not remember to have seen.

XI. — *Sermons preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary Church, in the Diocese of Exeter. By the Rev. W. MASKELL, Vicar.* London: Pickering.

THESE sermons are written with vigour and clearness; but we cannot recommend them to our readers as judicious or unexceptionable in tone or in doctrine. The Sermon on the Eucharist we think contains many questionable positions. We do not think it right to call the Sacrament "adorable:" there is no authority for such a term in our formularies; and we wonder to find the author assuming the duty of paying external worship to the Sacrament.

XII.—*Doctor Johnson: his Religious Life and his Death. By the Author of "Dr. Hookwell."* London: Bentley.

THIS is an interesting book, as indeed any collection of Johnson's opinions must be, though it does not tell us much that we did not already know. It seems very well executed on the whole. We cannot, however, sympathize with the author in his objections to Convocation, or his comfortable assurance that "the State has given you much discipline, especially of late, through Acts of Parliament!" We presume the author is speaking ironically. In this point the comment departs sadly from the text; for Dr. Johnson had very strong opinions on the subject of Convocation:—

"Boswell once said to him, as an instance of the strange opinions some persons would ascribe to him, 'David Hume told me, you said that you would stand before a battery of cannon to restore the Convocation to its full powers!' With a determined look he thundered forth, 'And would I not, sir? Shall the Presbyterian *Kirk* of Scotland have its General Assembly, and the Church of England be denied its Convocation.'"—p. 139.

And Johnson was perfectly right. If he thought Convocation necessary then, how much more necessary would he think it now, when Presbyterians and Dissenters are interfering in every way with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.

XIII.—*Original Ballads. By Living Authors. MDCCCL. Edited by the Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, M.A. Cantab.* London: Masters.

THERE is a great deal of very beautiful poetry in this elegant volume, which will, we are sure, gain a permanent place in our literature. We must quote the following spirited lines on "The

Battle of Drageshan, in the Greek war of Freedom," by the Rev. J. M. Neale :—

" In the deep grey of the morning, when Bulgarian cocks are shrill,
Our Hydriote scout, on panting steed, came pricking o'er the hill ;
And ' Mount ! ' he cried, ' each horseman ! each footman bend the
lance !

The circumcised battalions are in full and quick advance !
I heard the morning call to prayer of that unholy law,
And the dark Vizier is there himself, and Ibrahim Pasha ;
So let your sins be shriven well, and let your hearts be right ;—
There ' s many an one, I trow, shall sleep in Paradise to-night. ' "

And this description of the battle :—

" Ay ! here they come ; the crescent gleams above their mid-most fight,
By them that fell at Marathon ! It is a gallant sight !
Now, lance to breast, and gun to cheek, and sabre gleaming free,
And the prayers of them that died for Greece, and good Saint Dimitri !
Ho ! men of Joannina ! draw bridle and keep rank !
Count Capo d'Istria to the left ;—they seek to turn our flank !
Look to your priming, cannoneers !—be calm and play the men ;
Depress your pieces to the brook, and when they cross it—THEN ! "

pp. 209-10.

This is real poetry ; and there is much of the same kind of thing in the volume.

XIV.—*The City of God. A vision of the Past, the Present, and the Future, being a symbolical history of the Church of all ages, and especially as depicted in some of the scenes of the Apocalypse.* London : J. W. Parker.

THIS work consists of two parts, the first being an allegorical representation of the Church, entering into many details, and ingeniously enough wrought out. In the second the reader is supposed to be placed in the presence of one who wrote the symbolical history of the Church, and who becomes its interpreter. On the whole, it seems well executed, as far as we can see.

XV.—*Sermons of the late Rev. JOHN HAMILTON FORSYTH, ' M.A. Curate of Weston-Super-Mare, Somerset, and afterwards Minister of Dewry Chapel, Clifton. With a Memoir of the Author. By the Rev. EDWARD WILSON, M.A., &c. London : Hatchards.*

WE are really at a loss to understand the publication of this volume, or at least the long Memoir prefixed to it. We have no doubt Mr. Forsyth was a good man, but there seems to have been

nothing in his history or character calling for the Memoir. We trust there are thousands of such men in the Church, and it would be rather odd if every good clergyman were to have the honour not merely of a marble monument, but of a book. The sermons are moderately evangelical.

XVI.—*The Words from the Cross; a Series of Lent Sermons.* By W. H. ANDERDON, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Leicester. Second Edition, revised. London: Pickering.

THESE discourses come nearer to what we think the ideal of Christian Sermons, than almost any that we have seen. Earnestness in promoting God's glory and man's salvation is their great characteristic. The preacher has no theories to establish. His natural power of eloquence—the eloquence of feeling and of a cultivated mind—is laid aside as an object of display, and as it were forgotten, in the earnestness of his application to the souls of his hearers. It is a spirit of devotion which cannot fail to draw down a blessing on the hearers and the preacher. Were this powerful and faithful preaching of the Gospel universal—the days of primitive Christianity would be revived. The man who could preach thus, would be instant “in season and out of season” in the sublime work of his ministry.

XVII.—*Letters on Secession to Rome: addressed to a late Member of the Church.* By the Rev. JOHN LOCKHART ROSS, M.A., &c. Part I. Edinburgh: Lendrum.

THIS work consists of some letters written to a friend, with a view to induce him not to secede from the Church to Romanism. The author's persuasions were, it appears, ineffectual; but he has shown considerable zeal and research in his volume.

NOTE

We have just received and perused the Bishop of Exeter's “Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.” As these sheets are passing through the press, we have only time to express our sense of the high value and importance of the noble and Christian protest which the Bishop has here recorded. The portion of the letter to which we would direct especial attention is, pp. 48—52, in which it is demonstrated, that Mr. Gorham distinctly *denies that Regeneration* IS EVER GIVEN IN INFANT BAPTISM. It is *this* doctrine which the Committee of Council, and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, have virtually sanctioned by the recent decision. Can matters rest here?

The pressure of important matter in this Number obliges us to defer the notice of several other works.

ERRATUM.

In our last No. (p. 265, l. 18.) Dr. Pusey was, through some unaccountable slip of the pen, identified with those who have deified the Virgin Mary. It is well known, that Dr. Pusey is a decided *opponent* of such errors.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

AUSTRALIA.—*Church Discipline.*—At the ordination of the Bishop of Sydney, on Trinity Sunday last, the admission of one of the Deacons, the Rev. F. T. C. Russell, of St. Mark's Chapel, Sydney, was objected to on the ground of his having slandered his brethren in the ministry, and insulted the Bishop. The objection was raised on the day before the ordination, and on being subsequently cited into the Consistorial Court, he was sentenced to three months' suspension, and inhibited from performing any diaconal office until he shall have made satisfactory acknowledgment of his fault to the Bishop.

AUSTRIA.—*Church Government by Martial Law.*—In these days, in which Church government assumes all manner of aspects, the following specimen of Church government, as practised in Hungary by Field-Marshal Haynau, will not be uninteresting. In a circular, dated from head-quarters at Pesth, February 10th, and addressed to the military commanders of the different districts, the Field-Marshal, commander-in-chief of the army in Hungary, thus expresses the *quasi*-episcopal solicitude with which he attends to the "care of all the Churches."

"Wishing to remedy the melancholy condition to which the Protestant Church in Hungary has been reduced by some of her prelates, who have abused their official position for the furtherance of party purposes, and excited the people to rebellion, as likewise to secure to the congregations of that communion the exercise of their constitutional rights, even during the state of siege, under the limitations incident to that state, I have, after consultation with the commissioner-plenipotentiary for civil affairs, seen fit to decree as follows:—1. The functions of general inspector and district inspector among the Protestants, of the Augustan confession, and those of curator among the Protestants of the Helvetic confession, are to be considered as extinguished. 2. As the election of superintendents to fill the vacancies which have been created, according to the usual custom of election by the congregation, is, during the state of siege, inadmissible, and as, at the same time, men must be found, by whose means the Protestant clergy and laity may be contained within the bounds of law, and the further disorganization of the Church prevented, I shall appoint to the several offices of superintendents trustworthy men and men of character, who are temporarily to administer the ecclesiastical government, under the name of Administrators of the Diocese, in concert with the senior clergy of the diocese, whom they are to consult, and with a few men selected by themselves from among the laity. 3. The superintendents or their administrators will, during the continuance of the state of siege, perform,

along with their own, the functions of the former district inspectors and curators, and will, accordingly, transmit their petitions and suggestions to the superior authority, through the military commanders of the respective districts; and in order to preserve a proper account of the Church and school funds, hitherto administered by the general and district conventions, the said superintendents or their administrators will, after consultation with the senior clergy and with their lay assessors, make their report on the future administration of the said funds through the commander of their military district. 4. At all the consultations which take place of the district conventions, a military president, to be appointed upon petition by the military commander of the district, must be present. 5. As the incomes of the Protestant clergy are generally scanty, and the temporary rulers of the Church are to be enabled to devote themselves fully to their important calling, I shall obtain for them an allowance from the treasury for the time of their continuance in office. 6. The newly appointed administrators will be supported in the exercise of their functions by all the civil and military authorities. From the moment of their entering upon those functions, the functions of the superintendents to whose districts they are appointed are at an end. 7. The superintendents who are thus deposed from their office will continue to exercise their functions in the ordinary cure of souls, provided always that any further steps to be taken against them on account of their political conduct are hereby reserved. 8. A more suitable arrangement of the limits of the former superintendents' districts, with reference to the division of the country into military districts, and the appointment of the official residences of the temporary administrators, is a subject of urgent importance. The superintendents and administrators will find, on the part of the Government, a readiness of co-operation with regard to these, or any other arrangements which have for their object to connect the Protestant Church more intimately with the State, and to ameliorate its condition. 9. In accordance with these principles, which are to be notified in due course to the superintendents, inspectors, and curators, whom it may concern, I hereby nominate the following administrators:—here follow the names of the dioceses or superintendents' districts, and the names of the persons substituted in the places of the cashiered ecclesiastics; after which the mandate thus continues: "I expect of those men who are to be forthwith apprized of their nominations, and called upon to enter upon their functions, that they will, with judgment and zeal, perform their duties in a manner corresponding with the benevolent intentions of the Government, and calculated to promote the moral and religious well-being of the churches placed under their charge, whereunto they are to pledge themselves by a solemn vow to the commanders of their respective districts; and I shall expect to receive without delay reports as to the steps which have been taken in the matter.

"(Signed)

HAYNAU, Field-Marshal."

Fancy, some fine morning, Field-Marshal the Duke of Wellington issuing orders from the Horse Guards, deposing refractory bishops and

archdeacons, appointing others to take their places, and exacting from them the oath of canonical obedience; ordering diocesan synods and visitations to be held, in presence of an aide-de-camp, and the whole government of the Church to be carried on through the intervention and with the concurrence of the military commanders of the respective districts. The precedent seems really a tempting one, and might be more effectual in settling disputed points, than either application for a *warrant* in the Queen's Bench, or appeals to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. At all events, we thought the precedent too piquant, not to be brought under the notice of our readers.

Religious Statistics of Hungary.—Of the population of Hungary, more than 3,000,000 are Roman Catholics; more than 2,000,000 in Hungary and Transylvania profess the Reformed (Calvinistic) faith; a very small number adhere to the Augustan (Lutheran) confession; upwards of 44,000 are Socinians and Unitarians; and several thousands belong to the German Catholic Church. Of the Croats, two-thirds are Roman Catholics, and one-third German Catholics.

CANADA.—*Church Statistics.*—The following statistics are taken from a retrospect of the state of the Church in Canada, during the year 1849 :—

Clergy in the diocese of Toronto, 1st January, 1849	180
Deaths during the year	5
Superannuated	"	1
Left the diocese	"	3

		121

Ordained within the diocese during the year	14
Received from other dioceses	3

		17

Clergy in the diocese of Toronto, 21st December, 1849	138

Settled incumbents or missions	110
Travelling missionaries	8
Indian missionaries, having no other charge	7
Garrison chaplain, having no other charge	1
Assistant ministers	12

		138

Settled clergy have been established in the following places:—Pickering, Seymour, Marysburgh, Malahide, Owen Sound, Elora.

Rural Deans.—The Bishop of Toronto issued Commissions, on the last day of the year, to ten of his clergy to act as rural deans for the following districts :—the Home district; the districts of Simcoe; Gore and Wellington; Niagara; London, Huron, and Western; Brock and Talbot; Midland; Victoria and Prince Edward; Bathurst and Dalhousie; Johnstown, Eastern, and Ottawa.

CAPE.—Proposed College at Cape Town.—Bishop Gray has issued an appeal for assistance from the mother country, to aid him in his intention of establishing a collegiate institution in the vicinity of Cape Town, where he has already purchased a house, with about fifty acres of land for the purpose. The bishop's plan embraces the following objects:—

1. To erect collegiate buildings, capable of affording accommodation for fifty pupils, together with suitable rooms for the principal and other officers of the college, and, if possible, to build the chapel, library, and hall, with due regard to ecclesiastical and architectural beauty.

2. To provide an endowment for the principal, and a foundation for the maintenance of fellows, and of poor and deserving scholars.

The college is intended to embrace an upper and a lower department; pupils to be received into the lower department at the age of ten years, and to remain till the age of eighteen; the upper department to receive students at the age of seventeen or eighteen, if found duly qualified on examination. The education given to be such as to fit the pupils for secular employments and professions, as well as for the ministry of the Church.

It is proposed that the college should be governed by a body of statutes similar to those by which our ancient institutions in the mother country are ruled. The bishop will be visitor. There will be a principal, and, it is hoped, at no time fewer than three fellows and tutors, of whom one will be vice-principal. The principal will be appointed by the bishop: the other offices in the college will be filled up by the society itself, subject to the approval of the bishop, as soon as it is sufficiently matured to supply duly qualified candidates for them. In the meantime, the appointments to these offices also will rest with the bishop. The Rev. H. M. White, M.A., Fellow and late Tutor of New College, Oxford, will be the first Principal; the Rev. H. Badnall, B.A., Fellow of University College, Durham, Vice-Principal; T. B. Sykes, B. A., and H. Herbert, both of Worcester College, Oxford, Fellows and Tutors. The two gentlemen last named are to be admitted to Holy Orders next Christmas.

Suggestions for Missionary Proceedings in the Colony.—One of the Missionaries, who have recently gone out to the Cape, has sent home an interesting journal (extracts from which appear in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*) and has appended to it the following valuable suggestions, as to the best course of conducting the missionary work in the Colony:—

“1st. Whether it would not be advisable, instead of bringing men out from England, to ordain as Deacons certain ‘elder’ men of good report and honest conversation, if such be found, in destitute districts, who might offer the prayers of the congregation, and baptize, and perform such other functions as belong to the Deacon, without calling on them to quit their worldly employ, by which they get their bread.

“2nd. Whether it would not be best to restrict Deacons from preach-

ing, as a general rule, and, instead thereof, to limit them to the public reading of certain specified works.

" 3rd. Whether an order of unpreaching ministers would not tend to call people's minds back to a right regard for Liturgical Offices and Sacraments, which is now lost sight of in the feverish desire of listening to sermons. Also, whether the restricting Deacons from preaching would not give greater opportunities of preparing for Priest's Orders, to those whom it might be advisable afterwards to admit to that degree.

" 4th. Whether it might not be well to have one such Deacon attached to each Priest, where the population around him could furnish one such according to his choice.

" 5th. Whether a certain amount of ecclesiastical discipline in such men, (such as joining in the daily prayer, the observance of all holidays prescribed in the Prayer-book, and the like,) would not supply the place of much learning.

" 6th. Whether it would not be best to sanction and recommend that Divine Service should be held in the open air in places where there is want of church accommodation, and especially where there is a great amount of coloured population professing Christianity, but quite unable, from want of *free* room, to join in the worship of the Church.

" 7th. Whether it would not be well to recommend, in certain places, some division of the service on Sundays, in reference to catechising in the afternoon, and certain other exigencies.

" 8th. How far it is advisable to relax or alter the canon respecting sponsors. Should not parents be admitted?

" 9th. Whether it would not be well to exact, from those seeking Priest's Orders, the thorough digestion of some work bearing on Missions, and the principles and rules to be acted on in Missionary work.

" 10th. Whether some plan might not be adopted to promote the sale and reading of Church books among the members of the Church in the Colony, by means of an itinerant vendor, with a stock recommended by the Bishop."

FRANCE.—*The New Law on Education.*—After a severe and protracted conflict between the Conservative party and the Socialists, the new Education law of the French Republic has been passed by the Assembly. Several of its provisions provoked violent opposition on the part of the Romish bishops, among whom the Bishop of Langres took the lead; and although in all probability the French Episcopate will deem it prudent to acquiesce in the law as finally settled, yet no less than sixty-two different remonstrances against it have been transmitted to the Bishop of Langres by his colleagues. Being publicly challenged as to the nature of these declarations, the bishop himself has however declared, that they are not in the nature of protests. The bishop himself, who is a member of the Assembly, forbore to vote on the occasion. The following is an abstract of the law as it now stands.

It consists of 85 Articles, arranged under four titles :—

1. Of the authorities by whom education is governed ; 2. Of primary instruction ; 3. Of secondary instruction ; 4. General provisions.

Art. 1. Establishes a superior council of Public Instruction, consisting of the following members :—The Minister of Public Instruction, who is president of this council ; four archbishops or bishops, chosen by their colleagues ; one minister of the Reformed Church, chosen by the consistories ; one minister of the Church of the Augsburg Confession, chosen by the consistories ; a member of the Central Israelitish consistory, chosen by his colleagues ; three councillors of State, chosen by their colleagues ; three members of the Council of Cassation, chosen by their colleagues ; three members of the Institute, chosen at a general assembly of the Institute ; eight members nominated by the President of the Republic in council, selected from among the former members of the council of the University, the general or superior inspectors, the rectors and professors of the faculties, which eight members form a permanent section of the council ; and three members belonging to the category of free instruction, nominated by the President of the Republic, upon the proposition of the Minister of Public Instruction.

Art. 2. The members of the permanent section are appointed for life, removeable only by the President of the Republic in council, on the proposition of the Minister of Public Instruction. They alone receive a salary.

Art. 3. The other members of the council hold office for six years, but are re-eligible.

Art. 4. The superior council is to hold at least four annual meetings, but may be specially summoned at any time by the Minister of Public Instruction.

Art. 5. The superior council *may* be consulted by the minister upon projects of law relative to public instruction, and on any question connected with the subject which he may see fit to submit to them. The minister is *bound* to take their advice upon all regulations touching examinations, superintendence, inspection, and any other matter connected with public educational establishments ; also upon the assistance and countenance to be given to free establishments for secondary education ; upon the books to be introduced in public schools, and upon those which are to be prohibited in free schools, as being opposed to morality, the constitution, and the laws. The superior council is moreover the final court of appeal in cases falling under the jurisdiction of the academical councils. Lastly, the council is to present to the minister annually a report on the general state of education.

Art. 6. The permanent section of the Superior Council is charged with the preparation of all administrative measures, and may be consulted by the minister in reference to promotions and other points connected with the government of the *personnel* of education. It also makes an annual report to the Council.

Art. 7—10. Provide for the establishment of an "Academy" in every department ; to be governed by a rector, inspectors, and an academic

council. The rectors may be chosen indifferently from the body connected with public, or from the body connected with free, i. e. private instruction. They must be licentiates, and must have filled a higher post in some educational establishment for ten years at least. The Academic Council is composed as follows;—

The rector, who is president *ex officio*; an inspector of the academy, a teacher, or an inspector of primary schools, appointed by the minister; the prefect or his deputy; the bishop or his deputy; an ecclesiastic appointed by the bishop; a minister of one of the two Protestant Churches, appointed by the minister of public instruction, in those departments where there is a legally constituted Protestant Church; a delegate of the Israelitish consistory, in those departments where such a consistory is established; the *procureur-général* of the Court of Appeal, in towns where there is such a court, and in the other towns a *procureur* of the Republic at the tribunal of the first instance; a member of the Court of Appeal or the tribunal of the first instance, chosen by the court or tribunal; four members chosen by the council-general of the department, two of whom must be chosen from its own body. The deans of the faculties to be called in for consultation, but without a vote, on questions touching their respective faculties.

Art. 11. Modifies the foregoing arrangement for the department of the Seine, adapting it to the peculiar position of the capital.

Art. 12—16. Regulate the functions of the academic council, the elected members of which are chosen for three years. These bear generally upon the government of all the public schools, with a limited power of control over free, or private, establishments; subject, of course, to the orders of the superior council. Annual reports are to be made by the academic councils, and transmitted to the minister, for the information of the superior council.

Art. 17. Declares that the law recognizes two kinds of primary or secondary schools:—1. Schools founded or supported by the *commune*, the department, or the State, called *public schools*. 2. Schools founded or supported by individuals, or by associations, called *free schools*.

Art. 18. Provides for the inspection of the schools by the following functionaries, all of whom have a right of inspection:—1. General and superior (state) inspectors. 2. The rectors and inspectors of the academies, in their respective departments. 3. Inspectors of primary instruction. 4. The cantonal delegates, the *maire* and the *curé*, the (Protestant) pastor, and the delegate of the Israelitish consistory, as regards primary instruction. The ministers of the different denominations are only to inspect the schools of their own communion, or, in mixed schools, only the scholars of their own communion.

Art. 19—22. Provide for the appointment of the inspectors, by the minister of public instruction, with the advice of the Superior Council, and for the functions of the inspectors. In free or private establishments the inspection is limited to the questions of morals and health, and bears upon instruction only so far as to see that nothing is taught which is contrary to morals, the Constitution, or the laws. The

refusal to submit to inspection is punishable as a misdemeanor, and if repeated, may entail the closing of the school.

Art. 23. Determines the branches of primary instruction:—they are, moral and religious instruction, reading, writing, the elements of the French language, the first rules of arithmetic, with a knowledge of weights and measures; it may extend to the higher rules of arithmetic, to the rudiments of history and geography, of physical science and natural history; and to elementary instruction in agriculture, industry, sanatory knowledge, land surveying, drawing, singing, and gymnastics.

Art. 24. Provides that the instruction is to be given gratuitously to all the children whose families are unable to pay for it.

Art. 25, 26. Treat of the qualifications of the schoolmaster, among which is a certificate of capacity: ministers of the different denominations, while not interdicted by their own communions, are *ipso facto* qualified.

Art. 27—30. Regulate the formalities to be observed in the opening of a private or free school, the conditions on which the establishment of such free schools is to be sanctioned by the authorities, and the jurisdiction to be exercised over the masters of free schools by the Academic Council.

Art. 31—35. Treat of the qualifications, the appointment, the duties, and position of communal schoolmasters; express provision is made for the admissibility of members of religious orders to the office of communal schoolmaster.

Art. 36—41. Treat of communal schools, prescribing the establishment of sufficient schools in every *commune*, the circumstances under which separate schools for the different religious denominations, or else mixed schools are to be established, and regulate generally the management of communal schools.

Art. 42—47. Define the functions of the cantonal delegates, and other authorities charged with the government and supervision of primary instruction, and regulate the granting of certificates.

Art. 48—52. Contain the necessary modifications of the foregoing provisions, when applied to girls' schools and their governesses.

Art. 53. Regulates the establishment of *pensionnats* or boarding schools in connexion with primary instruction.

Art. 54—56. Regulate the establishment of adult and apprentice schools.

Art. 57—59. Treat of infant schools.

Art. 60—70. Regulate all private institutions for secondary instruction, among which ecclesiastical colleges are included. The provisions refer to the formalities to be complied with before opening an institution, to the qualifications of the master and of the teachers, to the State inspection, and the jurisdiction over all the institutions of the Academic Council, and, by appeal, of the Superior Council of Instruction. In determining the qualifications of the teachers, a species of academic jury of men skilled in *pari materiâ*, is brought into play, by which candidates are to be examined for their certificates. An ex-

ception from the regulations for opening an establishment of education is made in favour of ministers of any religion recognized by the State, who are permitted to educate, in their families, youths not exceeding four in number, without coming under the operation of the law. With regard to ecclesiastical colleges the law sanctions those already existing, subjecting them, however, to State inspection; but no new ones are to be established without previous authority having been obtained from the Government.

Art. 71—76. Provide for the establishment of public colleges. The municipalities of the towns where it is proposed to establish them, are required to comply with certain conditions, upon which the State, through the Superior Council of Instruction, gives its sanction, and in some cases pecuniary aid.

Art. 77—85. Are of a general character, harmonizing the provisions of this enactment with the general state of the law.

Projected Popish University.—The Provincial Council of Avignon having determined to establish a "Catholic University," has applied to the Pope for his sanction to the project, to be signified by a Papal brief.

A Jewish Professor of Philosophy.—An angry controversy has taken place in consequence of the Bishop of Luçon having put the *lycée* of Napoléon Vendée in his diocese under an interdict, on the ground of a Jew being appointed to it as Professor of Philosophy. The Episcopal Act to this effect has been violently attacked by the Liberal press.

Provincial Councils.—Among the decrees of the recent Provincial Council of Avignon, is one expressing the desire of the Council to have the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin declared an article of the faith, while another places the province under the special protection of "The Sacred Heart of Jesus." The Pope in his reply to a letter submitting the acts of the Council of Paris for his confirmation, thus expresses himself on the subject of these Councils—"Although from circumstances we have not yet received the documents, we are sure they will soon reach us, for we have ordered that they shall be forwarded to us with the greatest diligence. But in the mean time we feel desirous to congratulate you warmly, venerable brothers, on your admirable sentiments of religion and duty towards your pastoral charge, and the warm solicitude you have shown for the welfare of your dioceses; you have hastened, with the most praiseworthy zeal, and faithful to the wise prescription of the Holy Canons, according to our own wishes, to celebrate this council, in order to state in concert, in these hard and difficult times, what before God you have thought best calculated to excite and increase our Most Holy Religion amongst the people, and to keep up in them piety and purity of manners, and maintain ecclesiastical discipline. It is not certainly without true and profound consolation that we have learnt by your letter the desire which you have to re-establish in your own dioceses the Roman liturgy, already, to our great satisfaction, again put in use in several dioceses of France: and the determination which you feel, to apply with common accord all your care to remove, when circum-

stances will permit it, according to the rules of wisdom and prudence, the obstacles which have hitherto prevented you from bringing this affair to the desired end."

Clerical Conference.—The Archbishop of Paris has addressed to his clergy a pastoral letter accompanying three ordinances relating to ecclesiastical matters. The first establishes for five years severe examinations for young priests on the principal points of ecclesiastical knowledge; the second prescribes certain modifications in the diocesan conferences established at Paris by his predecessor; and the third orders for the diocese of Paris conferences for the examination of cases of conscience, as is practised at Rome. They are to be held every two months under the presidency of the archbishop, and are to be composed of all the priests of the diocese. The first of these conferences commenced on February 8, in the church of the Madeleine.

The Abbé Chantome.—The Abbé Chantome, of whose principles we gave a brief account in our last¹, having been cited before the "officiality" of the Bishop of Langres, to whose diocese he belongs, pleaded exemption, by virtue of a papal brief, from the jurisdiction of his ordinary. The court, however, overruled his plea, and the Abbé has since been suspended by a formal sentence from all his ecclesiastical functions.

GERMANY.—*Revived Church feeling.*—At a recent Assembly of Lutheran Clergy and laity held at Marburg, it was proposed by the Director of the gymnasium or college, that the ancient hours of prayer should be revived, and that in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, the bell should be tolled as of old, to give the signal for prayer, when every body at home, in the fields, and in the streets should stop and make a short pause for repeating a paternoster with the creed and the doxology, according to ancient practice. It was further suggested that at those times the church should be open, and the minister in his place to pray with such as might come to join with him. Not only was this not opposed, but it was added by one of the parties present, that the schoolmaster should bring his pupils to church regularly at those hours—a proposal which met with all but universal approbation. A decided movement for the revival of religion is likewise taking place among the clergy in the kingdom of Wurtemberg, a large number of whom have formed themselves into unions, with a central committee, for the purpose of providing a proper organization, with a view to united action upon questions affecting the Church and clergy.

Romish Home Mission.—At a general meeting, recently held, of the "Catholic Association" for Germany, it was resolved to found, under the name of the "Association of St. Boniface," a Romish Home Mission, whose operations are to be directed upon the Protestant parts of Germany, and those districts where Protestants and Roman Catholics are intermixed. Missions for reviving the religious feelings of the population in the Roman Catholic Districts have also been organized;

¹ English Review, vol. xii. p. 480.

and a wonderful account is given by the popish prints of the success of one of these missions in the Duchy of Baden, where Romanism had fallen greatly into decay. At the town of Seckingen, on the borders of the Black Forest, illustrious for the tomb of St. Fridolin, it is stated that thirty-two priests went on hearing confession for the space of twelve days from four o'clock in the morning till nine at night, the result of which was a conflux of communicants from a distance of ten, twenty, and thirty leagues round, to the number of 11,000. Similar accounts are given of a mission of this kind at Munster.

The Friends of Light.—This body of rationalists who, during the revolution, attempted to regain a regular footing in the established Churches, have been compelled to re-form their separatist ranks. Among others, Pastor Uhlich, at Magdeburg, who was deposed from his office as a clergyman of the Established Church of Prussia, in the autumn of 1847, and, thereupon, solemnly renounced all connexion with the Evangelic Church, but who, in the summer of 1848, during the revolutionary period, got himself re-elected by his former congregation of St. Catharine's, has been informed, that his election cannot be recognized, as he does not come within the qualifications of a candidate for the ministerial office according to the ecclesiastical law of Prussia. The coryphæus of the "Church of the Friends of Light," or "the Free Congregation," has therefore been compelled to fall back upon the reconstruction of his separatist body, resuming the position which he occupied before the revolution. He has since published, in a periodical which he conducts, the following graphic sketch of a portion of his followers: "We are perfectly aware that frivolity is not wanting in our ranks. Those who do not take a deep and serious view of life, are apt to catch at every new manifestation. Change is pleasurable to them, novelty attracts them. More especially, they delight in boldly opposing prejudices of all sorts, and they gratify their egotism by announcing loudly, that they have thrown off a yoke under which thousands are still bending their necks. We shall therefore find people in our ranks who are well aware what they do not want, but scarcely know what it is they want.—Unscrupulousness may also be met with in our ranks. Those who quarrel with any limit set to the indulgence of their appetites, are sometimes led to think that the "free congregation" is the very communion for them. Wherefore they join with the rest in protesting against priestcraft, but, in their hearts, their protest is aimed at the moral order established by God for the government of the world, which they find inconvenient. Unpromising members, certainly, of any congregation!—We have abolished all surplice fees. Our contributions as members of the congregation, are purely voluntary gifts of love, offered by every one according to his ability. This may have induced many to join us who have long grudgingly discharged their fees. A questionable motive this, no doubt, for joining the Free Church, especially if it be the only one.—Besides, it is to be considered, that in pulling down old things, we may, perchance, overthrow much that might

have been left to stand. It is impossible to fell a tree in the forest, without damaging and breaking down some of the surrounding trees. Many an old and obsolete doctrine may, in some hearts, be so identified with eternal verities and principles, that the one cannot be rooted out, without eradicating the other with it. In getting rid of the Triune God, we may lose sight of God altogether; and, with the Godhead of Jesus, a moral ideal may vanish, which hitherto has supplied the soul with firmness and strength." This protest of Uhlich against the use which he apprehends may be made of his congregation, as a place of refuge for all spiritual uncleanness and lawlessness, is remarkable not only for its extreme candour in acknowledging the fact that such a spirit as that described by him is abroad among the rationalists of Germany, and for its boldness in rebuking that spirit; but for the distinctness with which it enunciates the form and substance of his unbelief,—the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus being pronounced "old and obsolete;" pure Deism being substituted for belief in the former; and for belief in the latter, a reliance on the moral effect upon the heart and mind of a "moral ideal," to which the name of Jesus is attached.

The same undisguised openness in the denial of the Christian faith characterizes a "profession of principles" recently put forth by the "Free Congregation" at Halle, on the express ground that the declaration of its principles, which the "Free Congregation" made on its first institution, is no longer satisfactory. This "profession of principles" is as follows:—

"1. The belief of the Church in revelation having succumbed to the spirit of progress, and the whole doctrine and organization of the Church having thereby become powerless, we have united together in a new communion, in order to cherish in ourselves spiritual and moral life in accordance with the progress of the age, and to spread the same beyond our own communion in the world at large.

"2. We profess *humanism*, the religion of humanity, (*Humanismus, die Religion der Menschlichkeit*,) whose foundation, centre, and aim is the being and the welfare of man; we have taken our stand upon the basis of free science and of fraternity.

"3. In true human culture and in the union of all upon this basis alone, we see deliverance for mankind from this present distress, and the groundwork of a new life.

"4. The means which, according to our power, we employ for the attainment of these objects are:—Addresses for the development of our principles, as well upon all the various topics of life and science—discussions on the same subjects—promotion of self-tuition by the formation of libraries,—singing, music, and art generally—the education of the young—social meetings—diffusion of our views by word and writing.

"5. We proceed herein upon the principle that the word is free, and that there is to be a reciprocity of instruction and of quickening. Every

member is morally bound to promote both these objects to the best of his ability. Where existing abilities are insufficient, means must be used to attract the necessary abilities from without.

“6. The necessary funds are procured by self-taxation. Every ordinary member pays a contribution, to be fixed by himself, with reference to his own means, and the wants of the congregation, which contribution may be increased or diminished by himself under a change of circumstances.

“7. The right to order the affairs of the congregation, reposes in the body at large, which may exercise that right as it shall see fit, either by taking the sense of the majority, or by delegating its powers to individuals.

“8. Every man or woman being eighteen years old, is admissible as an ordinary member, every person under that age, as an extraordinary member. The ordinary members alone have a vote, and are bound to pay a contribution. Admission to ordinary membership is given, after previous notice to the governing body, upon profession of these principles by subscription; admission to extraordinary membership is given upon the declaration of parents or of others filling their place. The right of withdrawing is at all times free. The communion requires of all its members an honest and moral life, and active participation in its labours.

“9. We invite all who are of the same mind with us,—who, as in duty bound, desire to promote the universal ascendancy of truth and justice,—to join our communion.”

In transcribing this novel confession of faith, we cannot forbear calling particular attention to the enumeration of the means to be employed, under the fourth head; being the identical means which are at this moment put forward by certain parties in this country, both in the legislature, and in the public at large, as the means of elevating the social condition of the people. There is not the same plain-spoken candour in avowing the end; but, that the end is the same, the similarity of the means too clearly evinces. So striking is the parallel, that it requires only to be pointed out in order to carry conviction to the mind.

The German Catholics.—The infidel character of the body styling itself the “German Catholic Church” is becoming more and more manifest; and the consequence is, that the established Protestant communions, which at one time seemed disposed to hold out the right hand of fellowship to those separatists from the rival Church of Rome, refuse to connect themselves with them, or in any way to recognise them. In Bavaria the Supreme Consistory of the Protestant Church has issued a rescript, with regard to the position which the German Catholic congregations are to occupy in relation to the Protestant Churches, of which the following is the substance:—

“1. Forasmuch as the so-called Free or German Catholic congregations in Bavaria do not, according to their published confessions of faith, acknowledge the revealed Word of God as the only rule and standard

in matters of faith; and forasmuch as they reject the chief doctrines of the Christian Church based upon Holy Scripture, and frequently allege that their ideas of God, of man, and of the world, are altogether different from those of the existing Churches, for which reason also they declare themselves to be separated from the existing Churches, it follows that the Evangelic Protestant Church in Bavaria cannot hold communion with them.

"2. The said congregations administer holy baptism, not in the name of the Triune God, according to the rule of all Christian Churches, founded upon Christ's own command; they pledge the child to be baptized to no profession of faith, and generally they regard baptism, not as a reception into the communion of the Christian Church, but only as a reception into its outward society; consequently that act of theirs cannot be acknowledged as Christian baptism; but proper baptism must be administered to those who, having been formerly baptized in any of the said congregations, wish subsequently to join the Evangelic Church." The remaining parts of the decree declare the members of "free" or German Catholic congregations inadmissible as sponsors, and regulate the solemnization of mixed marriages and the settlement of property in such cases.

The provisions of this rescript have been abundantly justified since, by the Committee empowered to make preparations for the approaching General Synod of the German Catholic Church, to be held at Frankfort in May next. After considerable discussion, it was agreed that both the "Free Protestants," that is, the Rationalistic Separatists from the Lutheran and Calvinistic communions, and the "Free Jews," that is to say, the Jews who have exchanged their Judaism for rationalistic unbelief, shall be invited to attend the Council of the "German Catholic Church." The Council to be held will therefore be, in fact, a formal synod of unbelievers; the first event of its kind that has taken place since the promulgation of the Gospel,—when apostate members of Christian and Jewish Communions will meet together for the express purpose of constituting a Church on the basis of the rejection of all revelation.

The Irvingite Sect.—The Irvingite Sect is extending itself rapidly in Germany, and absorbing, naturally enough, whatever there is left of deep piety and religious sympathy among the shaking and tottering national Churches. One of the most notable conquests which the Sect has as yet made, is the "conversion" of Dr. Heinrich Thiersch, professor of divinity at Marburg, and, though not actually ordained in the Lutheran Communion, yet in progress towards ordination, being what is technically termed an "examined Candidate *cum veniâ concionandi*." In a letter which he has recently addressed to his ecclesiastical superior, the Lutheran Superintendent of the province of Upper Hessa, he draws the following picture of the present state of religion in Germany: "The revolution of 1848 has shown to what extent the destruction of the ancient faith, and of its fruit, a primitive, holy, and reverent temper, had proceeded, and how little is required to shake to its very

foundation the spiritual and moral character of our people. Experience has proved that, generally speaking, the voice of the most mischievous self-constituted leaders, and the influence of equally mischievous unions formed under their auspices, were far more powerful than the authority of the Christian Clergy. Not one of the real and deeply seated evils is remedied ; the means which the Church has at her disposal for promoting Christian discipline, righteousness, and godliness, have proved more than ever inadequate. This is the case not only in our German fatherland ; it is the state of all the nations of Christendom. The anti-christian principle has become one of the great powers of the world, nay, the greatest power of the age. Hence it is probable, that we are actually in the very midst of that time of terrible perplexity, for which, according to the prophecies of Holy Scripture, there is no other solution than the coming of Christ for the redemption of one, and the judgment of the other part of Christendom." After this sketch of the disorganized state of Christendom, Dr. Thiersch goes on to argue that, all the ordinary resources of the Church and of Christian civilization being exhausted, those that are to be healed can be healed only by some extraordinary interposition of God, by a manifestation of divine power, far more potent than any the world has yet witnessed. Thus, by a semi-theological, semi-philosophical train of reasoning, Dr. Thiersch arrives at the conclusion, that Irvingism is the very thing which the world wants at this moment, and thereupon professes himself to be a convert to this new revelation." After years of examination, after personal inspection, after a thorough acquaintance with the whole matter, he "bears witness" that God has made a beginning for the renovation of the Church, by the restoration of the necessary offices in all their purity and completeness, even of the Apostolate itself. For this conviction he declares himself ready to make any sacrifice. At the same time he maintains that the ministry which for the comfort and support of His children God is now raising up afresh, does not rise in opposition against those already invested with the office, but recognizes them in the hope of a reciprocal acknowledgment on the ground of the fruits of its labours. The name Irvingism he carefully eschews, setting forth his sect, in accordance with its pretensions in this country, as a new phasis of the Church.

The conversion of Professor Thiersch dates back as far as the year 1847. As soon as he had himself arrived at a definite conclusion, he submitted all he had heard to his ecclesiastical superior. Not having been ordained as yet in the Evangelic Church of Germany, he considered himself entitled to seek ordination, where it appeared to him "most legitimate and most salutary" to obtain it. He paid a visit to England, and is said to have been ordained as "Evangelist" for Hessa. In the course of last year, he began to hold meetings for public worship with his co-religionists. He resigned his post as professor, not on account of the change which had taken place in his religious views, but because he thought himself bound to devote more time to his new calling. "I do not find it easy," he says, in the concluding part of the letter before quoted, "to give up a profession for which I have been educated,

and to which I have devoted ten years of my life. But, however great my fondness for the office of academic teaching, I cannot conceal from myself how impossible it is to do any good to the Church, by a system of instruction which treats the most important thing of all—the doing the commandments of Christ—as a matter of secondary importance, which does not make religion its ground-work, but only admits its existence in a manner utterly nugatory, and therefore builds all upon sand. Neither do I intend the steps which I have now taken to be considered as a separation from the Evangelic Church, or as a display of ingratitude towards her. I and all those who are embarked in the same course with me are anxious to preserve a feeling of gratitude towards our mother Church, although we have found something higher than it, namely, the work of Apostolic reformation, in which we find all the verities of the Evangelic Church, and rich treasures besides.”

The reply of the Superintendent to this notification, while treating Dr. Thiersch personally with all tenderness and respect, contains a decisive condemnation of Irvingism, and of the course pursued with regard to it by Dr. Thiersch, whose assurance that he intended no separation from the Evangelic Church, he declares to be irreconcilable with the other contents of his letter, and with the position which he announces himself to have assumed. The Superintendent complains particularly that the new communion which Dr. Thiersch has joined, and which claims to be a higher and more comprehensive communion in which the Evangelic Church is to be absorbed, should fail to present to the Churches which it approaches with such lofty claims, a formal, definite, and public confession of faith, leaving the members of other communions to find out, as best they may, wherein its distinctive character consists. With regard to the ordination which Dr. Thiersch declared himself to have obtained, where he thought it most “legitimate and salutary” to do so, the Superintendent remarks that the Evangelic Church having an ordination of her own, which she deems sufficient and in all respects valid, cannot recognize within her pale another ordination by superiors placed beyond her pale, and laying claim to a higher authority. And as Dr. Thiersch proposes still to recognize the authority of the Evangelic Church, and of his own superiors in it, the Superintendent inquires officially, what functions and what obligations Dr. Thiersch has undertaken by virtue of his ordination in another communion? And further he inquires, whether his undertaking such functions and obligations, and receiving such ordination, setting aside the rule and order of the Evangelic Church in regard to the ordination and appointment of ministers, can be consistent with the prior obedience due from him to the Church for whose orders he was a candidate, whose licence to preach the Gospel he had obtained, and to which he was bound by the obligation of an oath? Adverting to the superiority ascribed by Dr. Thiersch to the new communion which he had joined, and to his apparent assumption of the right, by virtue of his ordination in it, to minister the Word and Sacraments, not only in that communion itself, but in the Evangelic Church also, as

being a subordinate body, the Superintendent distinctly refuses to recognize such a claim. "It is impossible," he says, "for an Evangelic Church to acknowledge a Church authority by the side of, or, properly speaking, above the existing and duly ordained government of the Church; a ministry by the side of, or, more accurately viewed, above the regularly called ministers of the Word; an altar, if not against, at least beside, or rather above, the existing altar, at which we believe that we find the promised blessing in accordance with the divine ordinance. Being in possession of the rich treasures of the Divine Word, to the pure and unadulterated declaration of which she binds her ministers; in possession of the Holy Sacraments, which she administers agreeably to the divine institution; in possession of all the means of grace, of which she stands in need for the service of her Lord, she will ever gratefully acknowledge any assistance rendered her by word or by writing for the confirmation of her members; but she cannot permit her members to form separate communions, to introduce a form, and to order seasons, of worship distinct from her own, including the performance of ministerial offices, and more especially the administration of the Holy Sacraments." Such irregular and unauthorized proceedings the Superintendent declares to be wholly incompatible with the order and discipline of the Evangelic Church, and intimates that Dr. Thiersch ought to know as much, without requiring to have it pointed out to him. In conclusion, the Superintendent calls upon Dr. Thiersch to consider whether the position he has assumed is compatible with that which he still claims to occupy; and, since they are incompatible, to make his option between the two, and either openly to renounce the communion of the Evangelic Church, or else to submit himself to her rule and order.

Death of Prince Hohenlohe.—Prince Alexander Von Hohenlohe, Provost of Greatwardein, whose pretended miracles excited so much attention some years ago, died at Vöslau, on the 14th November last, in the fifty-fourth year of his age.

ITALY.—The Jesuits.—Father Roothan, General of the Jesuits, has joined the Pope at Portici. Throughout the kingdom of Naples the members of the Order are taking possession again of their houses and other property.

NEWFOUNDLAND.—Church Education.—The Church is experiencing similar treatment from the Government in Newfoundland, respecting its schools, as at home. The legislative grant for education has been given among the Dissenters almost unconditionally, while the Church has been unable to obtain any share of it, on account of the terms insisted upon for its acceptance. The Bishop is laudably exerting himself to remove this injustice.

SPAIN.—Poverty of the Romish Church.—A petition, addressed to the Queen of Spain by nineteen incumbents of the Archdiocese of Toledo, states that out of the last four years' stipend, two and a half years' are in arrear; that in 1849 not a maravedi was bestowed either

upon the stipends of the clergy or the support of the churches. They announce the impending cessation of public worship for the want of supplies, and complain that the church presents in her ornaments as beggarly an appearance as the clergy in their gras.

SWITZERLAND.—*Statistics of the Romish Church.*—There are, according to a recent account in the Roman Catholic part of Switzerland, 2500 secular priests, and 1500 regulars in priests' orders, being at the rate of one priest to each 250 inhabitants. The number of nuns in the Swiss convents is stated at 1000. Their property is estimated as follows :—convents, twenty millions of Swiss francs ; other foundations, five and a half millions ; endowments of parish churches, near thirty millions.

UNITED STATES.—*Bishop De Lancey on Religious Training.*—The Charge delivered by Dr. De Lancey to the clergy of the diocese of Western New York, at the opening of the Convention in Trinity Church, Geneva, in the course of last autumn, and since published, furnishes an impartial and most valuable testimony to the great principle of Church Education. The Bishop distinguishes two systems in the process of religious education—the system of excitement, and the system of training. The former supposes the baptized individual to be incapable of religious or spiritual action, until he is, at some period of life, early or late, awakened, impressed and changed by the Holy Spirit ; with a view to whose action upon him it is necessary that human means should be used to arrest, disturb, and excite his mind on the subject of his salvation. The latter—the system of training—supposes the individual to be capable of religious exercises from the earliest period of intelligence, not by nature, but in virtue of imparted grace pledged by covenant to him ; by means of which, as he is empowered for moral action, so moral action is required, and may be acceptably rendered by him. Hence he is to be taught religious duties which he is to perform ; he is to be taught religious doctrine which he is to believe ; he is to be swayed by religious motives to which he is accessible ; he is to be led to moral obedience which he can render ; he is to share in Christian ordinances which are profitable to him. He is to be trained in knowledge, holiness, virtue, graces, spiritual duties, doctrines, ordinances, and in acts of faith, holiness, and grace that may attest his conformity to the will of God, and secure through Christ, as its meritorious origin, his everlasting salvation. Of these two systems the latter is that which the Bishop points out as the Church system, to be carried out in parochial schools:—

“By parochial or church schools, we mean the identification of religion as the Church holds it, with education ; educating our children as children of the Church, in schools of the Church ; providing each large parish, if possible, with a school of its own, where the children connected with it may be taught by competent religious teachers connected with the Church, who will make religion, as the Church holds it, not only the basis of all instruction, but the pervading principle and influ-

ence running through all its parts and progress, imbuing the mind with the knowledge of it, warming the heart with the love of it, and moulding the intellect and habits to its devotions, worship, doctrines, liturgy, and usages.

"Some, you know, hold that religion and education should stand apart from each other. Others teach, that morality only should be allied with education. Others, again, that only a general and abstract view of religion should be associated with education. Others, again, put forth their views in the form that education is to be unchurched. 'Education without a church' is the principle claimed and avowed to be the right principle.

"In opposition to such views, the true theory of the Bible and the Church is, that religion is the foundation of a sound education; that the God who gave the mind should govern the mind; that the expansion and training of the intellect should ever be according to, and in association with, His laws, influence, and grace; that to mould the intellectual habits without reference to the Deity and His laws, His institutions, and His Spirit, is in direct hostility to man's true interest, duty, and responsibility; and hence, that over the union of religion with education we are bound to pronounce the solemn declaration, 'what God hath joined together let no man put asunder.'

"Now this can only be carried out by Church schools and Church colleges, which shall unite, avowedly, religious instruction with literary instruction; which shall connect Church worship, Church doctrines, Church usages, Church feelings, Church principles, with the daily business of education; which shall daily present the great and glorious God before the mind, humble it on the knee of confession to Him, raise it in supplication to His throne, inspirit it by the melody of praise to Him, and send it forth in the feeling of utter dependence on His infinite mercy for existence, faculties, and knowledge; for redemption, grace, and glory, through the mediation of His blessed Son, and the power of His Holy Spirit.

"The Parochial School system keeps constantly before the eyes of both children and parents, the authority to which both are responsible. In its practical exhibition it is presented to view in some such form as this: The children assembled for receiving instruction begin by calling upon God in prayer, and singing to his praise. Those prayers and hymns are from the Prayer Book; the very services, in part, in which they are accustomed to unite on the Lord's Day in the sanctuary with their parents and friends. Sunday is thus carried into the school. They see that religion is not merely for the Lord's Day, or for the Church, but is something for every day; that it mingles with their learning and their business; that God is to be served, thought of, worshipped, obeyed, and loved in the school, as well as elsewhere.

"A reference to God's will is intermingled with all their learning. His doctrines are inculcated; duties to Him are enforced; the worship of Him is practised. Dependence on His Spirit for strength, on His blessed Son for pardon, on His Holy Word for light and guidance, is

constantly presented to the mind. The holy warnings, the earnest counsels, the warm appeals, the affectionate interest of a Divine Saviour, are brought to their view. In the principles, the grounds, the usages, the doctrine, the ministry which God has established, they are instructed by the Minister himself. In the nature, character, and claims of the holy and spiritual kingdom which Christ established, and taught his disciples to pray for in the daily petition, 'Thy kingdom come,' they are instructed why we adhere to its constitution as Christ gave it to us, why its Liturgy was adopted, how it conforms to Holy Scripture, and has for ages edified His members, in what relation they stand to the Church, how and why it should never be deserted, or discountenanced, or shunned.

In conclusion the Bishop argues that "the training system is the system of common sense, the system of analogy, the system of the Gospel, the true system ;" and after illustrating the first two propositions by remarks of a general nature, proceeds to demonstrate that "the training system is the system of the Church." This the Bishop does by reference to the sponsorial promises and the baptismal office ; to the Catechism, with the rubrics attached to it ; to the provision made for the confirmation of baptized children ; and to the Office for Confirmation, with its rubrics ; to the exhortation and prayers in the Communion Service, and to the twenty-eighth Canon of the General Convention :—

"It shall be the duty of ministers to prepare young persons and others for the holy ordinance of Confirmation.

"The ministers of this Church who have charge of parishes or cures, shall not only be diligent in instructing the children in the catechism, but shall also, by stated catechetical lectures and instruction, be diligent in informing the youth, and others, in the doctrines, constitution, and liturgy of the Church.'"

Planting of the Church in California.—Movement towards a Reformation in the Romish Church in South America.—The following extracts from a letter addressed by the Rev. Thos. Mines, an American Missionary in California, to a friend in New York, dated San Francisco, November 1st, 1849, give a graphic description of the state of religion in the gold country:—

"My first invitation to officiate as a clergyman was the Sunday we spent at sea, between New York and Chagres, on the 'Crescent City.' About a hundred persons assembled on Saturday evening, and, appointing a committee from all the companies on board, invited me to officiate the following day. I agreed to do so, but the day was the roughest we experienced on the trip, and thwarted our intentions. The attempt, however, was not lost. The formality of the proceeding, and the universal support it received, at an *impromptu* meeting, indicated that there were elements *en route* for California that gave good men good cause to hope. At Panama, I officiated regularly, gave the Holy Communion to some thirty persons on Easter Day, and held services appropriate to Passion Week I am quite confident that prudent measures would throw beauty and life again into the Church of New

Granada. See what has been done in Chili, in the international reformation of the Romish Church. The Church of Chili is, if accounts I have heard be true, far advanced in the path of Reformation. A Bishop is appointed; the Pope refuses to confirm the choice;—the nomination is renewed, in the form of a demand,—the Pope issues a Bull ordering the consecration, declaring that ‘We have *proprio motu* appointed the said A. B.,’ &c.:—the Bull is sent back, demanding the erasure of the *proprio motu*, as the nomination had been by the Church and government of Chili—and the Pope yielded. In Yucatan, as a military officer informed me, the papal authority was at that moment, for causes he did not know, disavowed and interrupted. In fact, the Romish Church in some of these countries has touched bottom, and I am sure her reformation might be effected. You will be surprised to hear that, since leaving home, the curate and several inhabitants of a certain place urged me much to accept the use of their church and perform our service. No explanation that I was not a Romanist, would be allowed. Officiate and preach I must. Only my engagements to leave the place the same day prevented my complying. I told them in answer to their questions, I was a ‘Christian—a Catholic,’—‘Apostolic’ too—not a Romanist—holding to no Pope—no prayers to saints—no masses or propitiatory sacrifices by Priests for the living and the dead—no auricular confession—no Purgatory, &c., &c.; but believed in the commemorative sacrifice—showed my Prayer-book—and was almost forced by them to exhibit our faith in its forms of worship. A Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian minister were present, and joined in the importunity—and I have since almost regretted that I did not do violence to all my plans, and accept the invitation. . . . We must have a man at Panama, Christian, Catholic, and Apostolic—acknowledging a priesthood and an altar—him they will hear.

“On the vessel from Panama to this port, I found our services numerously attended, and well sustained. At sea they are impressive, and possess a charm that cannot be counterfeited. This is found to be the case on board our men-of-war. Methodists, Presbyterians, all on board men-of-war, with scarcely an exception, use our forms; and any thing else appears incongruous with the majesty and the glory of the sea. Our congregation on board increased up to the very last Sunday, when the entire ship-full appeared to be present.

“On my arrival here, not being well enough to enter on the task, I waited till the 22nd of July, when, after Divine service (conducted by the Rev. Mr. Fitch, of Staten Island, who had officiated here a few Sundays, and myself), I stated distinctly the plan on which I had set out—the parochial—that and nothing else; and said, that if the congregation to which I might be attached was not organized here, independently of all missionary agency, I should go to some other point. Resolutions were adopted, and the 29th of July appointed for the election of wardens and vestrymen. Subsequently I was elected rector of the parish, the name of which is the Church of the Holy Trinity. At our last communion but one we had twenty-eight communicants, and

at our last thirty-six. I have already baptized two adults, and admitted five new communicants to the Church, the whirl in which we live seeming to lead certain thoughtful minds to seek something fixed and satisfied in the provisions of our holy faith. As soon as we could, we purchased a lot for six thousand dollars (for which we were soon afterwards offered ten) on an eminence commanding a view scarcely possible to be excelled. It is a lot, called here a fifty *vara* lot, nearly 140 feet square, large enough for church, rectory, Trinity-school (which we have in view), and other purposes. In the mean time, the rents of the unoccupied ground alone will, we suppose, more than half support the Church. Knowing that any building we could possibly now erect would not give satisfaction even a year hence, we have contracted for a temporary place of worship, twenty-five feet by fifty, of wood, and very plain, which will yet cost us (the building alone) eight thousand dollars. The church for posterity we hope to begin in a year or two. I am happy to say that we are likely to have this whole property from the beginning free from incumbrance and all debt. The new building is oblong—four windows in each side, two in the end—prayers, litany, and sermons on the chancel steps, just outside the chancel railing. Such a church in New York would perhaps have not cost over a thousand dollars. If churches could be brought out here by our clergy, or sent out here by some good layman, say five or six churches, with a view to a profit of 100 per cent. (which to a good Churchman ought to be sufficient), I guarantee their purchase here upon the spot. Our church will be sanded and blocked outside, and, if we can make it, for ever free. We have determined not in any case to sell pews, even if, for building rectory, school-house, &c., we deem it proper for a year or two to rent a part of them. Next Sunday we expect, by God's blessing, to offer up praise in the new sanctuary.

“On the 14th of September, I undertook, against many remonstrances, on account of prevalent sickness, a journey into the interior, and every where was welcomed as a messenger of rest to the weary. At Sacramento city, about 130 miles distant, on the Sacramento river, I officiated on the 16th of September, and at three successive meetings of the congregation or parish, which goes by the name of ‘Grace Church,’ and includes plans for a ‘Grace Church Academy.’ Messrs. Cornwall and Lee gave us on the spot a lot of land, valued then at 2000 dollars. This parish is now waiting for a clergyman. Only yesterday one of the wardens was here begging me to make, if possible, some arrangements for providing them the Church's services, which Mr. Fitch will be able partially to do.

“On the Sunday following I officiated, for large and interesting congregations, at a place called Vernon, one of the future cities, at the junction of Feather River and the Sacramento—a very eligible site, in direct communication with vast mining districts. Mr. Schoolcraft presented me a lot for a church in this place, and Mr. Crosby (a member of our late California State Convention) gave us another adjoining the former, the two together being 100 feet front, and 100 feet deep,

shaded by magnificent trees, and in the very best place. These gentlemen gave me a *carte blanche* to choose what lot I pleased. The agent of Captain Sutter has promised me, in glebes, an endowment of fifty acres each, for the churches of Vernon and Sacramento city.

“At San Jose, which I visited two weeks ago, I received the donation of a fifty vara lot (140 feet square), the gift of James F. Reed, for the use of an Episcopal parish, ten minutes from the State-house and public square (the late Convention having made this the seat of Government). It is important to have the Church here at once, and, if we are to have a Church University in this country, the valley of St. Jose is undoubtedly the place. . . .

“Wherever I go, I hear but one expression of feeling, that California need not draw upon the mites and stinted offerings to our Missionary Board. The feeling is: ‘We can take care of ourselves; let our starving missionaries nearer home be paid their dues, and be kept from starving; at the high rates and prices in California, the little the Missionary Society could do for us here would be only an incumbrance, and no relief.’ But if our Society are determined on real ‘missionary’ work in California, here are thousands and tens of thousands of Indians immersed in heathenism, who are docile and open to receive the white man’s religion. At Vernon, some thirty or forty Indians gathered around us, observing intently our religious rites. I visited their camp, having been attracted to it by the howlings and wailings the night before, and which were in commemoration of some of their dead. . . .

“The Indians in this country are stupid, and lack entirely the animation and intelligent fire of the aborigines toward the east. They are also darker, and approach decidedly to the features of the negro, though their hair is straight and long. The Missionary Society will find them perfectly tractable, harmless, and docile, and I doubt not Christianity would advance rapidly among them.

“The last few Sundays we have had the Crown Prince of the Sandwich Islands, and his cousin, at our church. They have attended regularly, joined in the services, and seemed much interested. It would be premature to anticipate the future on this subject, but I hear that the present king desires to have our Church represented in the islands, and that it will meet with favour, and will probably have the royal attendance. I have taken the necessary means to ascertain the true state of the case. Our Church will save the Sandwich Islands from the Romanists;—from much that I hear, perhaps nothing else can, as the old missionary influence and hold upon the people is represented as of doubtful duration.”

Consecration of the Bishop of Indiana.—On Sunday, Dec. 16, the Right Rev. Dr. Chase, Bishop of Illinois, and Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops of the United States, assisted by the Bishops of Kentucky, Ohio, and Missouri, and Dr. Kemper, Missionary Bishop, consecrated the Rev. George Upfold, D.D., Bishop elect for the diocese of Indiana.

New Diocese of Texas.—A new diocese has been organized in the

state of Texas. The primary Convention was held in Christ Church, in the city of Matagorda, on Monday, the first day of January, 1849, for the purpose of considering the propriety of organizing the Church of the said state into a diocese, when, among others, the following resolutions were adopted:—

“That the clergy and laity of said Church, living in Texas, are hereby united and formed into a diocese, to be styled and known as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Texas, and to be in union with the General Convention of said Church when admitted to a representation therein.

“That we place the diocese of Texas under the full episcopal charge and authority of the Right Rev. G. W. Freeman, D.D., Missionary Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, appointed to exercise episcopal functions in the states of Arkansas and Texas, and in the Indian territory south of 36 1-2 deg. parallel of latitude.

“That, inasmuch as the exigencies of the Church in Texas require organization, and it is still too feeble to support a bishop, that the Board of Missions be, and hereby are, respectfully requested to continue to us the aid hitherto extended.

“That the deputies to the General Convention be authorized and requested to apply for the admission of this diocese to representation in that body.”

Statistics of the Romish Church.—According to the data furnished by the Roman Catholics themselves, they have in the United States three Archbishops, 24 Bishops, 1081 Priests, and 1073 churches, or, including California and New Mexico, 1141 Priests, and 1133 churches. The Roman Catholic population is computed at 1,523,350 souls.

A Transatlantic Cardinal.—According to an announcement in the last message of the President of Mexico, Pius IX. has signified his desire to confer the dignity of Cardinal upon some Mexican Bishop, who will be the first Cardinal on the American continent.

Novel Practice of Anti-Pædobaptists.—It appears that, among the Baptists in Baltimore, a practice is growing up of “blessing” children, in imitation of the Saviour. The ceremony is performed either in the public congregation, or in private in the family circle; and the services consist of a prayer, and admonitions addressed to the parents. “If,” says a letter in the *Christian Intelligencer*, from a Baptist at Baltimore, “this custom were introduced into our Churches generally, it might perhaps modify or abrogate the present mode of infant baptism among our Pædobaptist brethren.” The practice is recommended by the Baltimore Baptists to their Baptist brethren throughout the Union.

THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

JUNE, 1850.

ART. I.—*The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul: with Dissertations on the Sources of the Writings of St. Luke, and the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients.* By JAMES SMITH, Esq., of Jordan Hill, F.R.S., &c. London: Longmans. 1848.

THE investigation announced in the title of Mr. Smith's work is one which requires a combination of qualities and capacities which are seldom found in the possession of a single individual. Classical scholarship, of no mean calibre or contracted span; antiquarian knowledge, stretching from the days of Pericles to the dawn of modern civilization; seamanship, both scientific and experimental; a familiar acquaintance with the lands and seas, the winds and waves of the Eastern Mediterranean,—all these requisites, together with patient industry and clear judgment, are needed. Nor is it too much to say, that all these are eminently possessed by Mr. Smith; and that all of them have been employed in considering the Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, and in elucidating the hitherto obscure subject of the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. The concluding Dissertation on the Sources of the Writings of St. Luke contains important matter and valuable suggestions; but the author has, we think, in more than one instance, arrived at conclusions which are not borne out by the arguments adduced to establish them.

Amongst the many false theories which a perverse ingenuity has broached and maintained, in defiance of a clear matter-of-fact, there is perhaps none more astonishing than that which represents the shipwreck of St. Paul as having taken place on the obscure island of Meleda, situated on the Illyrian side of the Gulf of Venice, instead of the well-known island of Malta, or Melita.

"Tradition," says Mr. Smith, "from time immemorial, has pointed out a bay in the island of Malta as the scene of St. Paul's shipwreck. It has never been known by any other name than 'Cala di S. Paolo,' or St. Paul's Bay. There is no mode of perpetuating the memory of events more effectual than that of naming places after them; but, although we can scarcely have a stronger case of traditional evidence than the present, in the following inquiry I attach no weight to it whatever. I do not even assume the authenticity of the narrative of the voyage and shipwreck contained in the Acts of the Apostles, but scrutinize St. Luke's account of the voyage precisely as I would those of Baffin or Middleton, or of any ancient voyage of doubtful authority,

or involving points on which controversies have been raised! A searching comparison of the narrative with the localities where the events so circumstantially related are said to have taken place, with the aids which recent advances in our knowledge of the geography and the navigation of the eastern part of the Mediterranean supply, accounts for every transaction—clears up every difficulty, and exhibits an agreement so perfect in all its parts as to admit but of one explanation, namely, that it is a narrative of real events, written by one personally engaged in them, and that the tradition respecting the locality is true.”
—p. vi.

Untenable as is the hypothesis that the Melita of St. Paul was the Meleda of the Venetian gulf, the investigation of the subject has been hitherto much obstructed by the want of information respecting the various localities in dispute, and the great ignorance which has prevailed up to the present time, regarding the vessels of the ancients, and their method of navigating them. Recent observations have, however, taught us much concerning the winds and currents of the Levant; recent surveys have furnished us with a correct outline of the coast of Crete. “At Malta, where we require to know not only the outline and peculiar features of the coast, but the soundings and peculiar nature of the bottom, we have Captain Smyth’s chart of the island, and, above all, his plan of St. Paul’s Bay, to a scale of 8 — 6 inches to the mile:”—A careful and judicious examination of all that ancient writers and ancient remains tell, either directly or inferentially, of the nautical science of the ancients, with constant reference to the accounts of early voyagers and the practice of Levantine sailors, has enabled Mr. Smith to clear up most of the difficulties existing with regard to the ships and navigation of the age of the Cæsars. And all these advantages have been increased and rendered more effective by a personal examination of the Cala di S. Paolo.

“A winter’s residence in Malta (says our author) afforded me ample opportunities for a personal examination of the localities. In the ships of war stationed there, I could consult with skilful and scientific seamen, familiar with the navigation of the Levant, an advantage I did not fail to avail myself of; and, as it is my intention to put my reader in possession of my authorities, I have never scrupled to name them. In the Knights’ Library I had access to an extensive collection of works, printed and manuscript, on the controversy as to the scene of the shipwreck, on the hydrography of the Mediterranean, and on local and classical antiquities. The following summer I spent on the Continent, and devoted my time almost exclusively to the investigation, with the advantages which the Museums of Naples, Florence, Lausanne, and Paris afforded. Since my return, I have continued it, with the advantages

our own country possesses ; particularly in the libraries and medal-rooms of the British Museum and Records of the Admiralty, and with a private library which I may term rich in early sea voyages."—p. xii.

Speaking of his own researches and qualifications for the task which he has undertaken, he adds,—

"I have, in the first place, endeavoured to identify the locality of a shipwreck which took place eighteen centuries ago. An attempt to do this would be of little value unless the geological changes to which sea-coasts are liable, which may or must have occurred in the interval, are taken into account. Now it so happens that this is a department of geology which I have been engaged many years in investigating."

After speaking of the importance in this investigation of "some practical knowledge of navigation and seamanship," Mr. Smith proceeds :—

"My knowledge of these subjects is only that of an amateur ; yet a yacht sailor, of more than thirty years' standing, can scarcely fail to have acquired some skill in those principles of nautical science which are common to all times. . . . I find, at all events, the knowledge I have thus acquired enables me to consult my nautical friends with advantage."

In addition to this, we are told that

"Nautical antiquities have long been a favourite study [with Mr. Smith] ; and not a little practical experience in planning, building, and altering vessels, has given me definite notions both of external form and internal capabilities ; whilst the opportunity of testing my conclusions by experiment, and the success of those I have made, give me confidence in their accuracy."

Mr. Smith has also derived much information "from the pictures and marbles exhumed at Herculaneum and Pompeii," and especially from the discovery of the inventories of the Athenian fleet, which were excavated at the Piræus in 1834.

With such advantages, and others which we have been obliged to pass over in silence, Mr. Smith has undertaken the investigation in question. We have been thus particular in detailing these advantages that our readers may feel at once assured that the author deserves a hearing : we now propose to join him in accompanying St. Paul and St. Luke on their memorable voyage.

Mr. Smith commences his Essay by some observations on the character and style of St. Luke. He points out various incidental touches which bear witness to his Antiochian origin, his medical profession, his classical education, and his intimate acquaintance with naval affairs ; the acquaintance however, as he shows, not of a sailor, but of a landsman who had been a good

deal at sea. He compares his account of the voyage with those of modern naval surgeons, and hazards the conjecture that St. Luke may, in the earlier part of his life, have sailed as medical attendant in some large vessel. The minute exactness of nautical phraseology, combined with the feelings and notions of a landsman, are curiously worked out by Mr. Smith.

But let us weigh anchor, and set sail ourselves, or we shall never arrive at the end of our voyage.

St. Paul, having been intrusted by Festus to a Roman centurion, by name Julius, set sail from Cæsarea in a vessel belonging to Adramyttium, bound to the sea-ports on the western coast of Asia Minor. They reached Sidon, a distance of sixty-seven miles, on the next day. The wind was, therefore, probably west; the prevailing wind in those seas. Hence they had intended to strike right across to the Lycian extremity of the great Pamphylian Bay—the Chelidonian Promontory. Being prevented by the prevalence of the westerly winds from making this straight course, they were compelled to steer in a northerly direction, slightly inclining to the west; and thus, under the lee of Cyprus, which they left on the left hand, enter the Cilician Sea, and, striking across it, avail themselves of the shelter of the continental coast and the assistance of the land breezes and westerly current. It has been conjectured that the Apostle sailed to the south and west instead of the east of Cyprus; but that this notion is erroneous is clear from St. Luke's statement of his crossing the Cilician Sea, which, supposing them to have steered north-west under the pressure of a north or north-east wind, they could not have entered: in fact, such a course was that which they desired to make, but from which they were prevented by adverse winds. Mr. Smith brings several passages from modern navigators, who, under similar circumstances, notice the prevalence of westerly winds, and cites examples of vessels which were compelled to take the same course as that indicated by St. Luke.

“Favoured, as they probably were by the land breeze and currents, they arrive without any recorded incident at Myra of Lycia, then a flourishing sea-port, now a desolate waste. The stupendous magnitude of its theatre attests the extent of its former population; the splendour of its tombs, its wealth.”—p. 30.

“The voyage has hitherto been prosperous, and the object which the party had in view in proceeding to ‘the places in Asia¹,’ is attained. At the first of them which lay in their way, the centurion found a ship of Alexandria, loaded, as we afterwards learn, with wheat, bound for

¹ The “*Asia*” mentioned by St. Luke, in Acts xxvii. 2, is the Roman province of which Ephesus was the capital. It is marked in Greek by the article, ἡ *Ἀσία*, as in Acts ii. 9; xx. 16; xxvii. 2, and many other places.

Italy, in which he embarked his charge. Egypt was at this time one of the granaries of Rome, and the corn which was sent from thence to Italy, was conveyed in ships of very great size. From the dimensions given of one of them by Lucian, they appear to have been quite as large as the largest class of merchant ships of modern times. We need not be surprised, therefore, at the number of souls which we afterwards find were embarked in this one, or that another ship of the same class could after the shipwreck convey them to Italy, in addition to her own crew."—p. 32.

It seems probable that the same westerly wind which prevented St. Paul's vessel from striking across from Sidon to Asia, had induced the Alexandrian to steer for Myra, which lies almost due north from Alexandria, as she could not take the direct course from Egypt to Italy.

"In this ship of Alexandria in which the centurion and his party embarked, they proceeded on their voyage. Their progress, after leaving Myra, was extremely slow; for we are told that it was many days before they were 'come over against Cnidus,' that is before they reached the entrance of the Ægean Sea. As the distance between the two places is not more than 130 geographical miles, which they could easily have accomplished with a fair wind in one day, they must either have met with calms or contrary winds. I infer that the delay was caused by unfavourable winds, from the expression μόλις, which is translated in our authorized version 'scarce,' producing the impression that the ship had scarcely reached Cnidus, when the winds became contrary; but which ought to be rendered 'with difficulty,' expressing the difficulty which ships experience in contending with adverse winds. The same word occurs in the following verse, where it is translated 'hardly,' where there can be no doubt as to its meaning . . . I am satisfied, therefore, that the words in the original 'βραδυπλοοῦντες καὶ μόλις γενομένοι,' 'sailing slowly and with difficulty, were come,' &c., express the delays which a ship experiences in working to windward."—p. 35.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Smith's interpretation of μόλις is the right one, and that the seventh verse may be rendered freely—*And after sailing slowly for some days, and having with difficulty arrived off Cnidus, as the wind would not allow us to pursue our right course* [which lay straight through the Ægean at about west by south], *we sailed under the lee of Crete by Cape Salmone*—i. e. they made for Cape Salmone, and thence sailed under the lee of Crete. In the next verse the αὐτήν refers, not to the promontory of Salmone, but to the island of Crete; and the whole verse may be rendered—*And beating up against the wind, we coasted the island until we arrived at a place called Fair Havens, near to which was the city Lasea.*

“The question now occurs, What was the direction of the wind which produced the effects recorded in the narrative?” It must have been a wind which would not permit the vessel to shape her course west and by south—which would allow her to go without any difficulty from Cnidus to Salmone—and which would admit of her slowly bearing up from Myra to Cnidus, and from Salmotte to Fair Havens.

Now if a wind can be found fulfilling all these conditions—if that wind be commonly prevalent in the Levant towards the close of summer—if under the pressure of this wind vessels do now actually take the same course under the same circumstances; then we shall be justified in assuming that we have found the wind which we are in search of. Now all these conditions are fulfilled by the north-west, “which cannot be more than two points, and is probably not more than one from the true direction. The wind, therefore, would in common language have been termed north-west.”

“This,” says Mr. Smith, after carefully working the problem out, “is precisely the wind which might have been expected in those seas towards the end of summer. We learn from the sailing directions for the Mediterranean, that throughout the whole of that sea, ‘but mostly in the eastern half, including the Adriatic and Archipelago, the north-west winds prevail in the summer months . . . the summer etesiae come from the north-west,’ (p. 197,) which agrees with Aristotle’s account of these winds. According to Pliny they begin in August, and blow for forty days.

“With north-west winds the ship could work up from Myra to Cnidus; because, until she reached that point she had the advantage of a weather shore . . . &c. At Cnidus that advantage ceased; and unless she had put into that harbour, and waited for a fair wind, her only course was to run under the lee of Crete, *κατὰ Σαλμώνην*, in the direction of Salmone, which is the eastern extremity of that island. After passing this point, the difficulty they experienced in navigating to the westward along the coast of Asia would recur; but as the south side of Crete is also a weather shore, with north-west winds, they would be able to work up as far as Cape Matala. Here the land bends suddenly to the north, and the advantages of a weather shore cease, and their only resource was to make for a harbour. Now, Fair Havens is the harbour nearest to Cape Matala, the furthest point to which an ancient ship would have attained with north-westerly winds.”—p. 37.

Those commentators who dispute this view of the question, are compelled to place Fair Havens on the north of Crete—its situation has, however, been ascertained beyond all doubt. Besides other evidence, Pococke says:—

“In searching for Lebena, further to the west, I found out a place

which I thought to be of greater importance, because mentioned in Holy Scripture, and also honoured by the presence of St. Paul, that is, the Fair Havens, near unto the city of Lasea; for there is another small bay, about two leagues to the east of Matala, which is now called by the Greeks Good or Fair Havens (Λιμένες Καλούς).”—p. 44.

The character of this place is not that of a harbour; it consists of two adjacent bays, slightly varying in their aspect, and each furnishing a good roadstead.

“Here we learn,” continues Mr. Smith, “they were detained till navigation had become dangerous, in consequence of the advanced state of the season. The fast, supposed to be that of the expiation, which took place about the period of the autumnal equinox, was now passed. It would appear that all hope of completing the voyage during the present season was abandoned, and it became a question whether they should winter at Fair Havens, or move the vessel to Port Phenicè, a harbour on the same side of Crete, about forty miles further to the westward.”—p. 46.

St. Paul assisted at the consultation which was held on this occasion, and warned them of the dangers which they would incur, should they attempt to make Port Phenicè—where it is to be however observed that the phrase ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν—should not have been rendered “but also of our lives”—but, “but also of our persons”—such being frequently the sense of ψυχή, and agreeing both with the context and sequel. The centurion, not being aware of the mysterious and unerring source of St. Paul's warning, preferred naturally the opinion of the ship's officers to that of his prisoner.

And since the roadstead [of the Fair Havens] was badly situated for wintering in, the majority were for departing thence also, if they could by any possibility make their way across to Phenicè so as to winter there—an haven of Crete having the same aspect as Libs and Caurus.

“Although they never reached this harbour, it becomes matter of importance to ascertain its position; because, unless we do so, we can draw no sound inferences respecting the ship's place when she encountered the gale, a point which it is of importance to determine. Phenicè no longer retains its name. . . . Lutro, Sphakia, and Franco Castello, places on the south coast of Crete, have each been supposed to be Port Phenicè. For our present purpose of ascertaining the ship's course, it is not very material which of them is meant; I am, however, satisfied that it is the harbour of Lutro.

“This harbour, however, looks to the east. I have already shown that the words of St. Luke in the original (proceeds Mr. Smith) are generally supposed to indicate a harbour open in the opposite direction;

unless, therefore, we get over this difficulty, we must give up the idea that Lutro is meant. The question as to the import of the passage must depend on the meaning we affix to the preposition "*κατά*," in connexion with the winds; I apprehend it means "*in the same direction as*" (in Latin, *secundum*). If I am right, *βλέποντα κατὰ Λίβα* does not mean, as is generally supposed, that it is open to the point *from* which that wind (Libs) blows, but to the point *towards* which it blows, that is, it is not open to the south-west, but to the north-east.

"Herodotus speaks of a vessel being driven *κατὰ κύμα καὶ ἄνεμον*: now, it is quite clear that, in this sense, a ship driven *κατὰ Λίβα* must be driven to the north-east. There is a passage in Arrian still more apposite to the point. In his *Periplus* of the Euxine he tells us that, when navigating the south coast of that sea, towards the east, he observed, during a calm, a cloud suddenly arise, 'driven before the east wind,' *ἐξερχόμενη κατ' εὐρον*. Here there can be no mistake; the cloud must have been driven to the west. When St. Luke, therefore, describes the harbour of Phenicè as looking *κατὰ Λίβα καὶ κατὰ Χῶρον*, I understand that it looks to the north-east, which is the point towards which Libs blows, and to the south-east, that *to* which Caurus blows. Now, this is exactly the description of Lutro, which looks, or is opened to, the east; but having an island in front, which shelters it, it has two entrances, one looking to the north-east, which is *κατὰ Λίβα*, and the other to the south-east, *κατὰ Χῶρον*."—p. 50.

Mr. Smith carefully verifies the position of this place, which lies on the south side of the Cretan Isthmus, in the Bay of Messara, due north of Clauda, the present Gozo.

The vessel did not remain long at Fair Havens after it had been decided that she should try to make Port Phenicè; for soon a gentle breeze arose from the south; and, supposing that they had obtained their purpose, loosing thence, they kept close in shore until they had rounded Cape Matala.

"A ship, which could not lie nearer to the wind than seven points, would just weather that point, which bears west by south from the entrance of Fair Havens. . . . From the anchorage at Fair Havens to Cape Matala the distance is four or five miles, and from thence to Port Phenicè the distance is thirty-four miles; and, as the bearing of the course is west-north-west, the south wind was as favourable as could be desired, being two points abaft the beam. They had every prospect, therefore, of reaching their destination in a few hours. Their course lay across the great southern bight to the west of Cape Matala. They had not proceeded far (*οὐ πολὺ*), however, when a sudden change in the weather took place . . . the ship was caught (*συναρπασθέντος*) in a typhoon² (*ἄνεμος τυφωνικός*), which blew with such violence, that

² Bloomfield has exhibited even more than his usual inconclusive prosiness in investigating the derivation of "*τυφωνικός*." For ourselves, we entertain no doubt whatever on the subject. Typho was the Egyptian devil; and although, in the

they could not face it, but were forced, in the first instance, to scud before it, for such is the evident meaning of the expression ἐπιδόντες ἐφερόμεθα, 'yielding to it we were borne along by it.'—p. 57.

The next point to be ascertained is, what was the direction in which the typhoon, or typhonic, gale³ blew. And here, again, we are enabled to arrive at a definite conclusion by considering the various conditions required, and indicating the only wind which fulfils them—which fulfils them all.

What wind would blow a vessel, which scudded before it, from the western side of Cape Matala to the south side of Gozo? What wind would drive a vessel, if she did not alter her course, from the south side of Gozo to the shore of the African Tripoli? What wind is there which is in the habit of suddenly arising in the Levant, accompanied by all the characteristics of a typhoon, when the prevailing westerly gales have been for a brief interval superseded by a "gentle south?"

To each of these questions the answer is the same, namely, "east-north-east!" And, such being the case, it matters little whether we read, as the appellation of the gale in question, ΕΥ'ΡΟΚΑΥ'ΔΩΝ, which Bloomfield renders "*east-souser*," or ΕΥ'ΡΥΚΑΥ'ΔΩΝ, which may be rendered "*broad-souser*," or ΕΥ'ΡΑΚΥ'ΔΩΝ, which may be translated "*EAST-nordest*," or ΕΥ'ΡΙΚΑΙ'ΔΩΝ, which has not yet been interpreted; it matters little, we repeat, whether we mingle wind with wave, or compound Latin with Greek, to produce a becoming title for the typhoon in question. The thing is the same, by whatever name we call it; the wind blows from the same quarter, under whatever title it is spoken of.

It is evident that the mariners lost no time in striking sail, and that they must have scudded under bare poles till they arrived off Clauda (Gozo). Taking advantage of the comparative stillness of the water close to this island, they took in the boat, and undergirded the vessel.

"Upon reaching it (Clauda) they availed themselves of the smooth water under its lee to prepare the ship to resist the fury of the storm.

time of the Cæsars, "ἄνεμος τυφωνικός" had become a technical term, it was, originally, nothing more than a nautical colloquialism, equivalent to "a devil of a gale."

³ "The term *typhonic*, by which it is described, indicates that it was accompanied by some of the phenomena which might be expected in such a case, namely, the agitation and whirling motion of the clouds, caused by the meeting of the opposite currents of air when the change took place, and probably, also, of the sea, raising it in columns of spray. Pliny, in describing the effects of sudden blasts, says, that they cause a vortex, which is called "typhoon;" and Gellius, in his account of a storm at sea, notices "frequent whirlwinds," "... and the dreaded appearances in the clouds which they call typhoons."—p. 60.

Their first care was to secure the boat by hoisting it on board. This had not been done at first, because the weather was moderate, and the distance they had to go short. Under such circumstances, it is not usual to hoist the boats on board, but it had now become necessary. In running down upon *Clauda* it could not be done, on account of the ship's way through the water. To enable them to do it, the ship must have been rounded to, with her head to the wind, and her sails, if she had any at the time, trimmed, so that she had no headway or progressive movement: in this position she would drift broadside to leeward. I conclude that they passed round the east end of the island; not only because it was nearest, but because there are dangers at the opposite end. In this case the ship would be brought to on the starboard tack,—that is, with the right side to windward. This must be kept in mind, because it throws light upon a subsequent passage.”—p. 65.

The boat was probably full of water, which increased the difficulty, mentioned by St. Luke, of getting it on board. The object of undergirding the vessel was to support and tighten her planks, so that they might exclude the water, and resist the waves. The practice, now uncommon, was so general in ancient times, that scarcely a vessel ever left a harbour on a long voyage without laying in a stock of undergirths (*ὑποζώματα*). We make a few short extracts on the subject of these articles from Mr. Smith's dissertation on the ships of the ancients.

“In the first place,” says he, after clearing away various mistakes of less intelligent writers, “they were external, as the name implied, ‘under zones.’ Plato, in his legend of the vision of Eros, compares the most distant starry zone to the hypozomata of galleys, binding the whole together. It is probable that ships were occasionally undergirded with wooden planks; but this could only be done in harbour. In the Louvre there is a statue of a marine goddess standing upon a galley, upon the sides of which planks are seen placed vertically. Polybius talks of ships being ‘undergirded’ before putting to sea, evidently meaning that they were to be repaired in a temporary manner; but this can have no reference to the ‘helps,’ which were carried with the ships for the purpose of being applied at sea, when required, which were necessarily flexible. Isidore of Seville mentions ‘the mitra’ as a *cable*, by which a ship is bound round the middle. Hesychius says, also, that they were ‘cables binding ships round the middle.’”—p. 174.

“It would appear from the Attic tables, that the hypozomata formed a regular part of the gear of every ship, and that they were laid up in the magazines.”—p. 177.

It appears needless to add, that the *helps*, or *hypozomata*, were bound round the middle of the vessel, at right angles to the length: they must not be confounded (as they are by Bökh and others)

with the *tormentum*, a contrivance occasionally made use of in the *naves longæ*, or vessels of war.

“Ropes were occasionally applied in a longitudinal as well as a transverse direction, to prevent ships from straining. ‘The tormentum is a cable in long ships, which is extended from stem to stern, in order to bind them together.’ . . . The ‘naves longæ,’ from the weight of the masts and towers at the extremity, and from their great length, must have been extremely apt to ‘hog,’ or fall down at each end; but as the stem and stern posts rose above the rest of the vessel, a simple way of preventing this would be, to pass a rope round them and heave a strain upon it, by twisting the parts together, as was done in the military engines called tormenta; and Isidore’s etymology of the name—‘tormenta, à tortu dicta,’ seems to confirm this.”—p. 176.

In modern times the practice of undergirding has not unfrequently been resorted to, in cases where circumstances have rendered it advisable. Falconer, in his Marine Dictionary, gives an account of the mode in which it is effected :

“To frap a ship (*ceintrer un vaisseau*) is to pass four or five turns of a large cable-laid rope round the hull or frame of a ship, to support her in a great storm, or otherwise, when it is apprehended that she is not strong enough to resist the violent effort of the sea. . . . It would not be difficult to multiply instances where this mode of strengthening ships has been put in practice in modern times. I content myself with the latest I can find. Captain (now Sir George) Back, on his perilous return from his Arctic voyage in 1837, was forced, in consequence of the shattered and leaky condition of his ship, to undergird her. It was thus done:—‘a length of the stream chain-cable was passed under the bottom of the ship, four feet before the mizen-mast, hove tight by the capstan, and finally immovably fixed to six ring-bolts on the quarter-deck. The effect was at once manifested by a great diminution in the working of the parts already mentioned, and, in a less agreeable way, by impeding her rate of sailing: a trifling consideration, however, when compared with the benefit received.’ ”—p. 66.

Mr. Smith adds in a foot note—

“The ‘Albion,’ 74, encountered a hurricane on her voyage from India, and was under the necessity of frapping her hull together, to prevent her sinking. *United Service Magazine*, May, 1846. The ‘Queen’ came home from Jamaica frapped, or undergirded; and the ‘Blenheim,’ in which Sir Thomas Troubridge was lost, left India frapped.”

After having taken these preliminary measures, St. Luke goes on to say:—“φοβούμενοί τε μὴ εἰς τὴν Σύρτιν ἐκπέσωσι, χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῦος, οὕτως ἐφέροντο.”

Upon this Mr. Smith very justly remarks:—

"It is not easy to imagine a more erroneous translation than that of our authorized version: 'Fearing lest they should fall into the quicksands, strake sail, and so were driven.' (ver. 17.) It is, in fact, equivalent to saying, that, fearing a certain danger, they deprived themselves of the only possible means of avoiding it. . . . Under the circumstances in which they were now placed, they had but one course to pursue in order to avoid the apprehended danger, which was, to turn the ship's head off shore, and to set such sail as the violence of the gale would permit them to carry. As they did avoid the danger, we may be certain, notwithstanding the silence of the historian, that this was the course which was adopted. I have already assigned my reasons for supposing that the ship must have been brought to on the starboard tack, under Clauda, for it was only on this tack that it was possible to avoid being driven on the African coast; when, therefore, they had taken every precaution against foundering which prudence and skilful seamanship could dictate, all that was required was, to fill their storm-sail, probably already set, and to stand on."—pp. 67, 68.

The expression which the authorized version renders "*strake sail*," Mr. Smith renders, "*lowered the gear*." With some diffidence we beg to propose a third suggestion—"having spread the customary sail." This, though at first sight preposterous, will, we think, when closely examined, turn out to be the right rendering of the contested expression. Let us go back a few verses. The vessel which bore the Apostle and Evangelist was crossing from Cape Matala to Port Phoenix, with a gentle breeze from the south, when suddenly she was caught in a typhoon which rose from the E. N. E. The gale was of that tremendous character well known in those latitudes at that season. The vessel was totally unable to make head against it. She was seized by it, we are told, and the sailors, without any choice, yielded to its fury, and scudded before it, till they came under the lee of Clauda⁴. Now it appears to us not improbable that, under such circumstances, they would, when first caught in the typhoon, lower every thing that they could lay hands on, to prevent their being swamped head foremost. Mr. Smith has shown what must have been the direction of the ship's head when, after the boat was in, and the vessel undergirded, she had passed Clauda (Gozo), and was again exposed to the full fury of the hurricane. It was now that the danger of being driven into the Syrtis, and the mode of escaping that danger, at once presented themselves.

⁴ In a note, occurring at p. 61, Mr. Smith observes, "*ὑποδραμόντες*," "*running in under the lee of*." St. Luke exhibits here, as on every other occasion, the most perfect command of nautical terms, and gives the utmost precision to his language, by selecting the most appropriate: they ran before the wind to leeward of Clauda, hence it is *ὑποδραμόντες*: they sailed with a side wind to leeward of Cyprus and Crete, hence it is *ὑπεπλεύσαμεν*.

“ And fearing lest they should fall into the Syrtis, having spread their sail, they were thus borne along.”

In defence of this interpretation we have to advance, 1. The antecedent probability that they had no sail whatever set at the time when they reached Clauda. 2ndly. The fact that Σκεῦος does not unfrequently stand for “the sail and its appurtenances.” 3rdly. That in the Septuagint version of Isaiah xxxiii. 23, they could not spread the sail, is rendered by ΧΑΛΑΨΩ. When we recollect the Alexandrian origin of that translation, and the fact that St. Luke was sailing on board an Alexandrian vessel, this will have some weight—to say nothing of the general influence of the style of that version, on all the writers of the New Testament.

We proceed again in Mr. Smith's words:—

“ We are thus forced to the conclusion, when we are told that they were thus borne along, οὕτως ἐφέροντο that it was not only with the ship undergirded, and made snug, but that she had stormsails set, and was on the starboard tack, which was the only course by which she could avoid falling into the Syrtis. With this notice concludes the first eventful day.

“ On the following day (τῇ ἐξῆς, ver. 18) the gale continuing unabated, they lightened the ship. Every step hitherto taken indicates skilful seamanship. In an old French work on maritime law, I find every one of these precautions pointed out as proper to be taken by able mariners under similar circumstances. . . .

“ On the third day they threw overboard ‘the tackling of the ship’ (ver. 19). From the expression ‘with our own hands,’ αὐτόχειρες, I suppose the mainyard is meant; an immense spar, probably as long as the ship, and which would require the united efforts of passengers and crew to launch overboard. The relief which a ship would experience by this, would be of the same kind as in a modern ship, when the guns are thrown overboard.

“ A dreary interval of eleven days succeeds; the gale continues with unabated fury (σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζομένων); neither sun nor stars can be observed; and at length we are told that ‘all hope of being saved was taken away.’ But why was all hope taken away? An ancient ship, without a compass, and without celestial observation, had no means of keeping a reckoning. This was, no doubt, a situation of danger, but not one of despair, for she might have been driven into safety. The true explanation, I apprehend, is this: their exertions to subdue the leak had been unavailing; they could not tell which way to make for the nearest land, in order to run their ship ashore, the only resource for a sinking ship; but unless they did make the land they must founder at sea.”—pp. 72—74.

ἰ “ Ἐρράγησαν τὰ σχοινία σου, ὅτι οὐκ ἐνίσχυσαν.” ὁ ἰστός σου ἐκλινεν, οὐ χαλάσει τὰ ἰστία, οὐκ ἀρεῖ σημεῖον ἕως οὗ παραδοθῇ εἰς προνομήν· τοίνυν πολλοὶ χωλοὶ προνομήν ποιήσουσι, κ.τ.λ.

Hope, however, now dawned upon them from the Source of hope. He who had before warned them of the perils which they were now suffering, is at length commissioned to announce their speedy deliverance; for *when there was much lack of food, Paul stood forth in the midst of them*, and related to them the words of an angel, who had appeared to him in a vision on a previous night.

The lack of food was occasioned not by the failure of provisions, for they were of course victualled for a long voyage, and the vessel was laden with corn; nor is it likely to have arisen from work and anxiety, leaving them neither the time nor the desire to eat; but it was the natural effect of the storm and its consequences: "Although the connexion between heavy gales and 'much abstinence,' is by no means obvious, yet we find it is one of the most frequent concomitants. The impossibility of cooking, or the destruction of provisions from leakage, are the principal causes which produce it." Mr. Smith illustrates this by the cases of Breydenbach dean of Mentz, John Newton vicar of Olney, and that of the Guipuscoa mentioned in Anson's voyage.

"At length, on the fourteenth night of their being 'driven through' (*διαφερομένων*) the sea of Adria,⁶ towards midnight the seamen suspected (*ὑπενόουν*) that land was near (*προσάγειν αὐτοῖς*), literally, was nearing them."—p. 78.

As they were in utter darkness, this suspicion has been generally attributed to some information conveyed to them either by the sense of smell or by that of hearing. As however the shore was to leeward, they could not have received any scent from it, they must therefore have heard the breakers on a rocky coast. Nor is it impossible that the foam might render itself visible to the practised eye of the sailor even when the night appeared pitch dark.

"If we assume that St. Paul's Bay, in Malta, is the actual scene of the shipwreck, we can have no difficulty in explaining what these indications must have been. No ship can enter it from the east, without passing within a quarter of a mile of the point of Koura; but, before reaching it, the land is too low, and too far from the track of a ship driven from the eastward, to be seen in a dark night. When she does come within this distance, it is impossible to avoid observing the breakers; for, with north-easterly gales, the sea breaks upon it with such violence, that Captain Smyth, in his view of the headland, has made the breakers its distinctive character. By a singular chance," says Mr. Smith, "I can establish an important link in the chain of

⁶ As the use of the word *Adria* is the chief ground for the untenable conjecture, that the Melita of St. Luke is the Illyrian Meleda, Mr. Smith has carefully proved that the term at that time included the expanse lying between Crete and Malta.

evidence respecting the identity of this locality, namely, that the distance at which the breakers could be seen here, is about a quarter of a mile, and that they are seen at this distance when the land itself is not seen.

“On one of those rare occasions when there was no ground swell, and a boat could land on the point of Koura, I landed with my friend, the Rev. Mr. Robertson, of Saline, and was engaged in demonstrating to him, upon the spot, how rigidly every one of the conditions required to make it agree with the narrative was here fulfilled. To the east lay the low and receding shores of Malta, no where ‘approaching’ within a mile of the track of a ship coming from Clauda, and which, therefore, could not be seen on a night such as that described in the narrative. In the opposite direction the shore, begirt with mural precipices (*τραχεῖς ὄρους*), where a ship would be dashed to pieces, but with ‘creeks with shores,’ into which she might be thrust; and on the rocks where we stood, not more than twenty feet above the surface of the sea, and totally destitute of vegetation, lay huge fragments of rock, forcibly torn up by the waves, and lodged at least twelve feet above the level of a tideless sea, affording no doubtful evidence of what must have been the force of the breakers in a gale from the Greco-Levante, E.N.E. (Euro-aquilo), the point to which it is most exposed.”—p. 80.

For fourteen days the vessel has been rushing through the foaming waters under the pressure of the unabated gale. Her crew and passengers are chilled by the cold, wet with the waves that have of late frequently broken over her side; they are weary from labour and sleeplessness; they are weak from lack of food; the fury of the storm has been clad in additional terrors by the denseness of the atmosphere, and the darkness of the sky; and now, at the dead of night, her death-note seems to be sounded by the voice of the ravenous surges lashing the murderous shore.

“Such indications are the usual harbingers of destruction. Here they call forth a display of presence of mind, promptitude, and seamanship, which could not be surpassed in the present day, and by which, under Providence, the lives of all on board were saved.

“However appalling the alarm of breakers may be to a ship unexpectedly falling in with the land on an unknown coast, and in a dark and stormy night, it afforded, in the present case, a chance, at least, of safety. The hope which was taken away is restored. They can now adopt the last resource for a sinking ship, and run her ashore; but to do so before it was day would have been to have rushed on certain destruction. They must bring the ship, if it be possible, to anchor, and hold on till daybreak, when they may, perhaps, discover some ‘creek with a shore,’ into which they may be able ‘to thrust the ship.’”

Having thus followed the course of St. Luke’s narrative, from the moment of his first embarkation to the eve of the shipwreck,

we are now called upon to consider the last disputed question, viz., whether the spot to which Maltese tradition points as the scene of that catastrophe be really so or not. Mr. Smith proves, to our entire satisfaction, that it is so, by showing the number of conditions required to identify the spot, and their exact fulfilment in St. Paul's Bay. We must again let him speak for himself.

“The first circumstance mentioned is, that, at midnight, the shipmen suspected the vicinity of land, evidently without seeing it. The ship was driving from Clauda; her previous track must have been at such a distance from the land, and the land itself must be so low, as to prevent its being seen. Now, upon laying down the track of a ship driving in that direction to St. Paul's Bay, on Captain Smyth's Chart of Malta, I find that the land, which in that part of the island is very low, nowhere approaches within a mile of it, but that it is impossible to enter the bay without passing within a quarter of a mile of a low rocky point, which juts out and forms its eastern entrance (the point of Koura). When the 'Lively' frigate unexpectedly fell in with this very point, the quartermaster on the look out, who first observed it, states, in his evidence at the court-martial, that, at the distance of a quarter of a mile, the land could not be seen, but that he saw the surf on the shore. Here, then, we establish the explanation of a hitherto unexplained passage of Scripture by a competent witness. Till the ship arrived at the entrance of the bay, they could not be aware of the vicinity of land; when they did come to it, they could not avoid being aware of it. When they did so they sounded, and found twenty fathoms. But a ship coming from the eastward must, immediately after passing the point, pass over this depth. It is quite true that every ship, in approaching the land, must pass over twenty fathoms and fifteen fathoms. But here, not only must the twenty fathoms depth be close to the spot where they had the indications of land, but it must bear east by south from the fifteen fathoms depth, and at such a distance as would allow of preparation for anchoring, with four anchors from the stern; for we are not to suppose that ships from sea, unexpectedly falling in with land, can be prepared to anchor in an unusual manner on the instant. Now, about half an hour farther, estimating the ship's rate of progression by the time which had been hitherto consumed, we find the depth to be fifteen fathoms. Here we are told 'that, fearing lest they should have fallen upon rocks, they cast four anchors out of the stern.' This implies that there were rocks to leeward, on which, if they had not anchored, they must have fallen; but the fifteen fathom depth is, as nearly as possible, a quarter of a mile from the shore, which is here girt with mural precipices, and upon which the sea must have been breaking with great violence. Upon the former alarm the ship weathered the point; here it was impossible. From the position of the ship's head, the breakers must have been seen over the lee bow. Their only chance of safety, therefore, was to anchor; but to do so successfully in a gale of wind, on a lee shore, requires not only time for preparation, but

olding ground of extraordinary tenacity. In St. Paul's Bay the anchorage is thus described in the sailing directions :—

“ ‘ The harbour of St. Paul is open to easterly and north-east winds. It is, notwithstanding, safe for small ships, the ground generally being very good ; and while the cables hold there is no danger, *as the anchors will never start.* ’—p. 161.”

—p. 92.

Mr. Smith then proceeds to show, which he does most satisfactorily, that the anchoring by the stern, instead of the prow, was not a practice peculiar to any particular class of ancient vessels, but an expedient which they adopted to meet the circumstances of the case ; inasmuch as, in the first place, it is far easier to arrest a ship's way by the stern than by the bow ; and, secondly, the position of the ship thus anchored afforded greater facilities for running her ashore next day, which was the captain's ulterior object.

“ It is proper, however, to observe, (proceeds Mr. Smith,) that from the very necessity of the case, the ancient navigators were forced to depend much more upon their ground-tackle than the moderns. Ships constructed and rigged like theirs, could not, when caught in a gale, work off a lee shore, they must of necessity anchor ; hence they must have been very amply provided with anchors and cables, and habituated to the use of them in every possible contingency. I may also add, that, as both ends of their ships were alike, there was nothing in their form to prevent this mode of anchoring from being put in practice.”—p. 93.

We now come to one of those numberless passages which show the immense research and minute practical examination which Mr. Smith has employed in the elucidation of his subject.

“ There is still one difficulty to be obviated, which I am indebted to a naval friend for starting. Upon pointing out to Captain McLean, R.N., whose authority I have already cited, the advantageous position in which it placed the ship for the purpose of running her ashore, he replied, ‘ Very true ; but were the ships of the ancients fitted to anchor by the stern, had they hawse-holes aft ? because, if they had, we are only coming back to old practices.’

“ This is the difficulty of a seaman, who immediately thinks of how the thing is to be done. I must admit myself too much of a landsman to have thought of it ; otherwise I should have been able to have answered it, which I was not at the time : for I had copied from the ‘ *Antichita di Ercolano*,’ the figure of the ship in the picture of Theseus deserting Ariadne, which contains details, showing, not only that they were so fitted, but the manner in which it was done ; and that, too, in a ship so strictly contemporaneous with that of St. Paul, that there is nothing impossible in the supposition, that the artist had taken his subject from that very ship on loosing from the pier of Puteoli. A hawser is seen

towing astern, it ran through the rudder-port, and within board it is seen coiled round an upright beam or capstan, in front of the break of the poop-deck."—p. 94.

It is probable that the rudders were lifted out of the water, and secured by lashings, a measure which, under the circumstances of the case, would be as difficult as it was important. "We are not expressly told that this precaution was taken, but we learn indirectly that it was: perhaps also the mainmast was cut away."

"The advantages," observes Mr. Smith, "of being anchored in this manner are, that by cutting away the anchors (*τὰς ἀγκύρας περιελόντες*), loosing the bands of the rudders (*ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδαλίων*), and hoisting the artemon (*ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα*), all which could be, as they were in effect, done simultaneously, the ship was immediately under command, and could be directed with precision to any part of the shore, which offered a prospect of safety. Whereas, if anchored in the usual mode, she might have taken the 'wrong cast,' or drifted on the rocks, before she was under command."—p. 96.

The interval which now succeeded was one of intense anxiety; but the most laboured description of the situation and feelings of those concerned, cannot surpass in force and graphic truth the simple words of St. Luke, when he tells us that after taking these precautions they "wished for the day."

"When the day broke they did not know the land; but it had certain peculiarities, and unless we can show that the shore to the west of the ship's supposed position possesses the same peculiarities, it will not agree with that mentioned in the text. The first of these is 'rocky places' (*τραχεῖς τόπους*), the fear of falling upon which at night had caused them to come to anchor. Now the shore here is skirted with precipices, against which the ship must have been dashed to pieces, had she not been anchored. The next is 'a creek with a sandy beach' (*κόλπον ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν*); and the third is a place of two seas (*τόπον διθάλασσον*). It will be seen how perfectly these features still distinguish the coast."

After identifying these circumstances with that happy ingenuity and lucid accuracy which distinguish his work throughout, Mr. Smith goes on to another equally striking point.

"Selmoon Island," says he, "which separates the bay from the sea on the outside, is formed by a long rocky ridge, separated from the mainland by a channel of not more than a hundred yards in length. Near this channel, which a glance at the chart will show, must be where a ship from the eastward would be driven: they ran the ship ashore (*ἐπώκειλαν τὴν ναῦν*); the fore part stuck fast (*ἐρείσασα*), and

remained entire, but the stern was dashed to pieces by the force of the waves. This is a remarkable circumstance, which, but for the peculiar nature of the bottom of St. Paul's Bay, it would be difficult to account for. The rocks of Malta disintegrate into extremely small particles of sand and clay, which when acted upon by the currents, or surface agitation, form a deposit of tenacious clay; but in still water where these causes do not exist, mud is formed; but it is only in the creeks where there are no currents, and at such a depth as to be undisturbed by the waves, that the mud occurs. In Captain Smyth's chart of the bay, the nearest soundings to the mud indicate a depth of about three fathoms, which is about what a large ship would draw. A ship, therefore, impelled by the force of a gale into a creek with a bottom such as that laid down in the chart, would strike a bottom of mud, graduating into tenacious clay, into which the fore part would fix itself, and be held fast, whilst the stern was exposed to the fury of the waves."—p. 104.

This very interesting chapter entitled *THE SHIPWRECK*, concludes with some appropriate illustrations of the circumstances and sufferings of the voyage, extracted from two modern accounts of vessels similarly circumstanced: "that of a crazy ship, undergirded and struggling with a gale, namely, Captain Back's; the other, of a ship caught in a typhoon, namely, the Indian Company's ship 'Bridgewater.'" In the last chapter, headed "*THE VOYAGE FROM MELITA TO ITALY*," the few objections still remaining are combatted and fully answered, and the crew and passengers safely landed at their destination.

Thus have we followed minutely the course of St. Luke's narrative as explained and illustrated by his able commentator—and we can safely say that we have never taken a more pleasant voyage or found a more intelligent and delightful companion.

We have already quoted at some length from the dissertation on the ships of the ancients. We will only therefore express our entire concurrence in Mr. Smith's carefully established opinion, that the *artemon* was the foresail, and extract a passage in which he sums up his view, of the mode in which the rowers were arranged in an ancient trireme.

"The thalamite I suppose to have sat on the deck, not far from the side of the vessel; and to have rowed in an oar-port little higher than the deck, and probably little more than two feet above the water; and the distance between two successive oar-ports of the same tier I suppose to have been about three feet six inches. About fourteen inches nearer the stern, and about fourteen inches higher than the oar-port of a thalamite, was the oar-port of a zygite, who sat on a bench, or stool, placed upon the deck, on the inner side of the thalamite, about fourteen inches in front of his seat, and whose oar worked in the angle made by the

body and legs of the thalamite. Immediately over the heads of the thalamites a platform extended from the side of the vessel, probably not extending so far inwards as the zygites, but reaching to their shoulders; and this platform projected a short distance over the side of the vessel. On this platform the thranites sat and rowed: their oar-ports were arranged along the outer edge of the platform; each oar-port being about fourteen inches nearer the stern than the nearest oar-port of a zygite, and fourteen inches nearer the bow than the nearest oar-port of a thalamite; being about three feet higher from the water than the oar-ports of the thalamites, and one foot nine inches higher than the oar-ports of the zygites. The highest oar-port was, therefore, probably not more than five feet above the water; a height not too great for the use of the oars mentioned in the Attic Tables, viz., nine, or nine and a half cubits, or about eleven feet."

In the Dissertation on the Sources of the Writings of St. Luke, Mr. Smith has laboured, and we think successfully, to prove that the Gospel of St. Mark is an apostolically authorized translation from a memoir written many years before, by St. Peter, in the Aramæic or Syro-Chaldee dialect. The only difficulty which Mr. Smith meets with in the way of this conclusion—a difficulty which will, we think, vanish upon a more careful investigation—is, that Eusebius quotes a passage from Papias, which our author gives thus:—"Καὶ ταῦτα ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε,—Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν;" and which he renders—"The Presbyter (John) said this: Mark was the translator of Peter, and he wrote accurately the things which he remembered." We, however, entertain no doubt but that Peter is the subject of ἐμνημόνευσεν, and Mark of ἔγραψεν: nor should we hesitate to render ἐμνημόνευσεν, *recorded*—"Mark wrote what Peter recorded." The sense is still clearer as it stands in the text of the Cambridge edition (the best, we believe) of Eusebius—"Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν,—which we should give thus: "Mark being' the translator (or interpreter) of Peter, wrote accurately whatsoever he (Peter) recorded."

We cannot leave this Essay without transcribing a passage which has greatly interested us, in that it satisfactorily explains a circumstance in our Lord's history which has been made a handle of by the foes of our holy religion. We give it *in extenso*. The incident referred to occurs in the narrative of "the sick of the palsy:" St. Matthew ix, St. Mark ii, and St. Luke v.

"It is long since the incident of the entrance by the roof has been made a handle of by those whose object it was to discredit the writings

⁷ γενόμενος, literally, "having been," or "having become."

of the Evangelists. It is right that such objections should be stated as broadly as possible, in order that they may be answered. I take Strauss's statement of them, as embracing them all. He says,—

“ ‘ In the description of the scene, in which the paralytic (Matt. ix. 1, ff. parall.) is brought to Jesus, there is a remarkable gradation in the three accounts. Matthew says simply, that, as Jesus, after an excursion to the opposite shore, returned to Capernaum, there was brought to him a paralytic, stretched upon a bed. Luke describes particularly, how Jesus, surrounded by a great multitude, chiefly Pharisees and Scribes, taught and healed in a certain house, and how the bearers, because, on account of the press, they could not reach Jesus, let the sick man down to Him through the roof. If we call to mind the structure of Oriental houses, which had a flat roof, to which an opening led from the upper story ; and if we add to this the rabbinical manner of speaking, in which the *via per portam* was opposed to the *via per tectum*, as a no less ordinary way for reaching the ὑπερῶν, upper story or chamber, we cannot, under the expression καθίναί διὰ τῶν κεράμων, understand any thing else than that the bearers, who, either by means of stairs, leading directly thither from the street, or from the roof of a neighbouring house, gained access to the roof of the house in which Jesus was, let down the sick man, with his bed, apparently by cords, through the opening already existing in the roof. Mark, who, while with Matthew he places the scene at Capernaum, agrees with Luke in the description of the great crowd, and the consequent ascent to the roof, goes yet further than Luke, not only in determining the number of the bearers to be four, but also in making them, regardless of the opening already existing, uncover the roof, and let down the man through an aperture newly broken.

“ ‘ If we ask here, also, in which direction, upwards or downwards, the climax may most probably have been formed, the narrative of St. Mark, which stands at the summit, has so many difficulties, that it can scarcely be regarded as nearest the truth ; for not only have opponents asked, How could the roof be broken open without injury to those beneath ? but Olshausen himself admits that the disturbance of the roof, covered with tiles, partakes of the extravagant. To avoid this, many expositors suppose that Jesus taught either in the inner court, or in the open air in front of the house, and that the bearers only broke down a part of the parapet, in order to let down the sick man more conveniently. But both the phrase, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, in Luke, and the expression in Mark, render this conception of the thing impossible ; since here neither can στέγη mean parapet, nor ἀποστεγάζω the breaking of the parapet, while ἐξορύττω can only mean the breaking of a hole. Thus, the disturbance of the roof subsists ; but this is further rendered improbable, on the ground that it was altogether superfluous, inasmuch as there was a door in every roof. Hence help has been sought in the supposition, that the bearers indeed used the door previously there, but because this was too narrow for the bed of the patient, they widened it, by the removal of the surrounding tiles. Still, however, there remains the danger to those below ; and the words imply an opening actually made, not widened. But dangerous and superfluous as such a proceeding would be in reality, it is easy to explain how Mark, wishing to elaborate the narrative of St. Luke, might be led to add such a feature.’—vol. ii. p. 311.

“ It is quite true that there is no difficulty in entering Eastern houses by the roof. How, then, was it necessary in this case to break open the roof ? How came St. Luke to mention ‘ tiling,’ seeing the roofs of Eastern houses are flat, and covered with cement ? And how could the roof be broken open without endangering the inmates of the house ? The answer to these questions will be best furnished by an examination of the peculiarities of the structure of the roofs of the houses of the East.

“ Dr. Shaw, in his Travels in Barbary, has produced an array of authorities, from ancient writers, to show that the preposition διὰ does not necessarily mean ‘ through ;’ that στέγη might mean, the awning of

the open court (impluvium), which was merely drawn aside, and the man lowered over the wall. This is evading the difficulty rather than answering it: and the word ἐξορύξαντες, in St. Mark's account, implies violence; especially when we find that it is super-added to ἀπεστέγασαν, uncovered, or unroofed. Neither can I understand how a person upon the roof can be lowered *by* the tiling, although it is quite intelligible that he should be lowered *through* it when broken open.

"The answer to these difficulties I apprehend to be this.—The roof is itself flat; but the opening in it is necessarily covered by a secondary roof, to keep out the rain; just as the entrance from the deck to the cabin of a ship is covered by a secondary roof called 'the companion.' Now these secondary roofs are frequently sloping, and covered with tiles; and it will easily be understood why it might be necessary to remove such a roof from the horizontal opening, or trap-door, in order to allow a person in a horizontal position, in a couch, to pass through it. The removal of a few tiles would probably not occupy many minutes,—the replacing them not many hours: hence St. Matthew left the circumstance unnoticed, as unimportant; whilst St. Luke, by adding 'through the tiling,' explained it. It is sufficiently obvious that such a process could not injure those below."—pp. 274—277.

We have already entered so fully into Mr. Smith's merits, that we have nothing to add, save the hope that this may not prove his last work,—and the wish (alas! how vain!) that all those who undertake to write upon equally important subjects would bring to the task as much knowledge, as much patience, as much good taste, and as much good sense.

ART. II.—1. *Report of the Case of the Right Rev. R. D. Hampden, D.D., Lord Bishop Elect of Hereford, in Hereford Cathedral, the Ecclesiastical Courts, and the Queen's Bench.* By RICHARD JEBB, Esq., M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: Benning and Co., 43, Fleet-street. 1849.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Law.* By RICHARD BURN, LL.D. By ROBERT PHILLIMORE, D.C.L., Advocate in Doctors' Commons, &c. London: Sweet; V. and R. Stevens, and G. S. Norton.

THE course of events around us renders it essential to enter on the examination of questions, which, in times of more quiet and security, might have been safely left at rest. It has been the will of Providence to alter very widely the character of the State in England from what it formerly was; and this alteration, brought about by circumstances over which the Church could not exercise control, and which have certainly led to this result without her free will and consent, has exercised, and threatens to exercise, a most dangerous influence on the Church herself. As long as the State was united in faith to the Church, as long as all offices in the State were restricted to those who declared themselves members of the Church, the union of Church and State was a reality, as far, at least, as theory went; but when the legislation of the last twenty-two years has removed all that ancient system by which the State was united in faith to the Church, and ministers, judges, peers, members of Parliament, and officials of all kinds, may now be of any creed, the State has wholly changed the position in which she formerly stood to the Church. The State, until the reign of George IV., was a "Church of England" State. It is now a State without any creed: it has, as a State, no distinctive belief: and yet, notwithstanding this complete revolution in the character of the State, it still retains precisely the same powers and influence over the Church of England which it did previously.

It may be the opinion of some persons, that the State *ought* to possess the same powers over the Church which she now does, and even increased powers. We are not about to discuss this question; but we presume that every one must feel, that, looking at the case merely as a question of *fact*, the State, which exercises precisely the same influence over the Church that she has done for three centuries, has ceased, within the last twenty-two years,

to be what she had always before been, *of the same faith as the Church of England.*

We ought, perhaps, to apologize for claiming any faith for the Church of England. There are, we know, many persons, of creeds differing from that of the Church, or of no creed at all, who are in the habit of asserting or assuming, that the members of the Church of England have no distinctive belief; that their creed has been prescribed by Acts of Parliament; and that they are bound to alter their views as Parliament shall dictate. Of course such assertions are either simply offensive and insulting, or else made for controversial purposes. But, without attempting any reply to misrepresentations, which are sufficiently obvious, and easily to be refuted, the plain fact is, that members of the Church of England *have* a positive belief, hold certain doctrines, and are as warmly and strongly attached to them as the members of any other religious communion are to their peculiar tenets. There may be latitudinarians in the Church of England as there are in other communions. There may be men who care little about any religion: there may be men who are secretly dissatisfied with some doctrine of the Church, and wish to evade or subvert it. But, notwithstanding this, the Church of England is a body holding a certain creed, and firmly and resolutely attached to it; so that very many of its members would adhere to the doctrine of the Church, at all hazards, and, if necessary, in opposition to the mandates of the temporal powers. In so doing, they would merely act on the principle of the right of conscience, which every other denomination of professing Christians in the empire has acted on, and which the Legislature has recognized in the amplest manner in their case.

The case, then, is as we have stated it. A large body of Christians—the *largest* communion in the empire, holding certain distinctive religious tenets—is now under the influence and authority of a State, which has ceased to hold those tenets, and which has no settled creed at all, a State composed of members of all sects, who can agree on no one point in religion. A State thus negative in its religion now exercises the full authority over the Church of England, which the Church agreed to entrust to the State only on the condition or assumption of the peculiar religious character of the State. A State which has no positive religion has, by law, not merely the nomination of bishops, but the *absolute* and *arbitrary* power of nominating whom it pleases to that office in the Church, on which the efficiency, the sanctity, the discipline, and the doctrine of the Church mainly depend.

Now, we are very far, indeed, from any sympathy with those who have, in various past ages, assailed the Church of England,

and the Crown of England, on this question. Doubtless the appointment of bishops by the Crown of England was treated as a great infringement on all sound principle, by those who had persuaded themselves that all episcopal power emanated from the Pope, and that the appointment must therefore come from him. And Dissenters, too, had their objections, not only to episcopacy in general, but to the interference of the State in the appointment of bishops. The arguments of these opponents of the Church and the State were ably and satisfactorily met by the divines of the English Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and we cordially admit the force of their arguments on behalf of the order of things under which they found themselves. There were plenty of instances of Christian princes nominating to bishoprics, to be found in history. There could not be any objection on principle to such nominations. Nay, the whole history of the Roman communion, even to the present day, shows Roman Catholic princes in the full exercise of the right of appointing bishops in their States. Indeed cases may be pointed out, in which the see of Rome has consented that sovereigns not of its own creed should have the right of nominating to Romish sees in their States; and Russia and Prussia are existing instances. In such cases as these, however, the appointment to episcopal sees is regulated by special concordat, or agreements between the ecclesiastical and temporal powers.

We are very far from denying, in general, that the appointment to episcopal sees may not be lawfully and rightly vested in the hands of the temporal rulers. We contend, on the contrary, that it may very fitly be given to them, and that the laws of England, in the position of the country in former times, were perfectly defensible as regarded episcopal appointments.

But while this is maintained, it must be remembered that there is a view of the subject directly contrary to that of Dissenters and members of the Church of Rome, and which not merely asserts the lawfulness of State appointments to episcopal sees, but claims it as a matter of positive right and indispensable necessity. To such thinkers, appointment by the Crown is a notion which they cannot disengage from the idea of a bishop; or, the power of the Crown under all circumstances to nominate to episcopal sees is held as a fundamental principle of right, a prerogative which is so inseparably annexed to the Crown, that it cannot, in the nature of things, be divided from it. Those to whom we allude are as absolute and as unreasonable dogmatists in their way, as the highest advocates of the papal claims in theirs.

But, after all, the right of the Crown to every one of its pre-

rogatives must be open to discussion in the present day. Those who claim for the Crown the absolute right of appointing bishops, must be prepared to prove the justice of that claim, or they will imperil the power they maintain; for, in the present day, nothing that is incapable of defence on rational grounds can long maintain its place.

When we come to consider the actual ground, then, on which the right of the Crown to nominate to episcopal sees is established by jurists, we find it resolve itself into the privilege arising from the assumed *foundation* of all the sees of England and Wales by the sovereigns.

The following extract from the speech of the Attorney-General, in the case of Dr. Hampden in the Queen's Bench, traces briefly the steps by which the State acquired the power of nominating to bishoprics. We shall take the liberty of offering occasional comments on it.

“My Lords, I find this matter [of canonical elections] sufficiently explained in a book to which my learned friend referred, but in a passage which he did not notice, in his motion, in the first instance. In ‘Ayliffe’s Paragon,’ p. 126, we read, ‘When cities were first converted to Christianity, the bishops were elected *per clerum et populum*; for it was then thought convenient that the laity, as well as the clergy, should be considered in the election of their bishops, and that both laity and clergy should concur in the nomination of them; because he who was to have the inspection of them all, might come in by a general consent.’”
—*Case of Dr. Hampden*, p. 124.

The Attorney-General here admits, on the authority of Ayliffe, that elections of bishops were, in the first instance, *free*; that the clergy and laity elected their own bishops; that the State had nothing to do with the matter. This is, indeed, indisputable. No one ever dreamt in those days of giving the nomination of bishops to sovereigns who were not Christian. The reason, too, assigned for elections by the clergy and laity then, applies at all times: the bishop has still the inspection of clergy and laity, and the “convenience,” therefore, of their taking part in elections of bishops, is sufficiently manifest. But to proceed:

“But as the number of Christians afterwards very much increased, this was found to be very inconvenient; for tumults were raised, and sometimes murders committed at such popular elections; and particularly, at one time, no less than three hundred persons were killed at such an election. To prevent the like disorders, the Emperors, being then Christians, reserved the election of bishops to themselves; but in some measure conformable to the old way, that is to say, upon a bishop’s death, the chapter sent a ring and pastoral staff to the emperor, which

he delivered to the person whom he appointed to be Bishop of the place."

We believe there is truth, to a certain extent, in the statement here made, that the Christian emperors and other sovereigns made the divisions and disputes which sometimes arose at elections, a pretext for interfering in the appointment of bishops, and gradually taking to themselves the nomination. Yet we do not see why the mere fact of disputes or disturbances in elections, should have led to the substitution of nomination for election. There have been many serious riots in elections for Parliament, and much blood has been shed at times in such elections; and yet the Crown has never claimed the right of nominating the representatives of the people. We cannot see, therefore, why the mere fact of occasional disturbances at elections, ought to have been a sufficient ground for Christian emperors to "reserve" to themselves the privilege of nominating bishops, thus, in fact, depriving the clergy and laity of the Church of their original rights. The equitable course would have been, to make such regulations as would be sufficient for preserving peace and good order in elections of bishops. The right of the emperors was, then, according to Ayliffe's statement, admitted by the Attorney-General, founded in usurpation of the rights of the Christian clergy and laity.

"And though the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, who in process of time got to be the head of the Church, was well enough pleased to see the clergy grow rich, yet he was not satisfied that they should have any dependence on princes; and therefore he pretended that they took money for their nomination of bishops, or (at least) charged their revenues with pensions; and thereupon the canons in cathedral churches came to have choice of their bishops, which, by an encroachment of the Papacy, were usually confirmed at Rome."

It is not our business to defend the proceedings of the Popes in this matter, or to investigate their motives. Most persons, however, will be inclined to believe, that if the Popes have shown a disposition at times to encroach, and to derive pecuniary advantages from the Church, the State has been just as liable to the same imputation. The emperors who could extinguish the freedom of elections on pretence of occasional disturbances, were not likely to be very scrupulous in their use of the power thus attained. It was doubtless employed then, as it is now, for purposes of State policy.

"But princes had still some power in these elections; for we find in the Saxon times that all ecclesiastical dignities were conferred in Parliament."

It is not our intention here to correct any historical inaccuracies. We will therefore only remark, that if "ecclesiastical dignities" were sometimes "conferred in Parliament," it does not follow that they were conferred by the Crown alone. In fact, the only claim here made is, that princes had "some powers" in elections of bishops, which may be safely admitted.

"And this appears by Ingulphus, Abbot of Crowland, in the reign of William the Conqueror, who tells that *a multis annis retro-actis nulla erat canonica prælatorum electio*; because they were donative by the delivery of the ring and pastoral staff as aforesaid."

The sovereigns, in those ages, frequently restored the temporalities of sees, after the election had taken place; and they did so in the way here stated, which was considered by the greater part of the Church to be unlawful; so that a bishop thus appointed, was irregularly appointed in their opinion. There can however be no doubt, that the sovereigns of England *did* give investiture by pastoral staff and ring, and thus showed that they had "some" power in disposing of bishoprics. This donation did not necessarily interfere with the freedom of elections, which were generally held *previously* to the royal "donation" of the bishopric.

"Hildebrand, who was Pope in the reign of the Conqueror, was the first that opposed this way of making bishops here; and for that purpose he called a council of 110 bishops, and excommunicated the Emperor Henry IV., and all prelates that received investiture at his hands, or by any layman, *per traditionem annuli et baculi*. But, notwithstanding that excommunication, Lanfranc was made Archbishop of Canterbury at the same time, and by the same means, according to Malmesbury; but the Saxon Annals in Bennet College Library are, that he was chosen by the senior monks of Christ Church, together with the laity and clergy of England, in the King's great council."

The appointment of Lanfranc shows exactly what we have said, that the royal donation of bishoprics, or investiture by ring and pastoral staff, was quite consistent with elections. Here we have a case, in which the election took place first, and was followed by the investiture. It may be observed, in order to avoid mistakes, that Lanfranc was made Archbishop of Canterbury *before* Hildebrand was made Pope.

"Howbeit, Anselm did not scruple to accept the bishopric by the delivery of the ring and pastoral staff at the hands of William Rufus, though never chosen by the monks of Canterbury: and this was the man who afterwards contested this matter with Henry I. in a most extraordinary manner. For that king, being forbidden by the Pope to dispose of bishoprics as his predecessors had, by the delivery of the ring and staff, and he, not regarding that prohibition, but insisting on his

prerogative, the Archbishop refused to consecrate those bishops whom the King had appointed: at which he was so much incensed, that he commanded the Archbishop to obey the ancient customs of the kings his predecessors, under pain of being banished the kingdom. This contest grew so high, that the Pope sent two bishops to acquaint the King, that he would connive at this matter so long as he acted the part of a good prince in other offices; whereupon the King commanded the Archbishop to do homage, and to consecrate those bishops whom he had made. But this being only a feigned message, to keep fair with the King, and the Archbishop having received a private letter to the contrary, the Archbishop still disobeyed the King. And at length, after several heats, the King yielded up the point, reserving only the ceremony of homage from the bishops, in respect of the temporalities, to himself: whereunto Anselm consented, provided it was done before consecration. And then the Archbishop consecrated those bishops whom the King had appointed, and promised that no person elected to be a prelate should be refused consecration, because of the homage he had done to the King."

This statement represents one side of the question. However, it establishes this instructive fact, that the Crown, in the time of King Henry I., was obliged to relinquish privileges and prerogatives which it had become possessed of, whether rightly or wrongly; and the right of the Church to a considerable influence in the election of bishops was distinctly admitted.

"And then a passage proceeds to state, as your lordships know, that, in the result of that controversy between the Pope and the Crown, King John granted a charter, that bishops should be elected by canonical election; reserving to himself the power of veto, and the power of receiving the profits during the vacancy of the see. 'Now, to add more solemnity to this matter, and that canonical elections might not seem usurpations on the King's prerogatives, in appointing whom he pleased to vacant sees, King John, by his Charter *de communi Baronum consensu*, granted that bishops should be canonically elected, provided leave was first asked of him, and his assent required after such election, and that he might have the temporalities during any vacancy. So they were then chosen by the dean and chapter, or by prior and convents: but yet the King retained this ancient prerogative of recommending the person to them; and, that he might influence the election, he usually sent for the dean and chapter, or some of their number commissioned by the rest, who met in his royal chapel, or in some church near it, and there chose the person he had recommended.'"

If such were the state of the case,—and we are not disposed to deny its truth to a certain extent,—the only inference, we think, that could be fairly drawn is, that the sovereigns of England employed every expedient in their power for subverting free elections, while the law of the land, and their own promises, strictly

pledged them to grant free elections. To call chapters into the royal presence, and to recommend them to elect certain persons, was really to interfere with those liberties which the law of the land guaranteed. A similar course of proceeding in reference to the election of a member of parliament would be understood as a gross violation of the liberties of the people.

And yet these sovereigns, who thus interfered with elections which the law declared to be free, had no scruple in remonstrating against the Popes, when they reserved the appointment to bishoprics to themselves, and in claiming the right of *free elections* for the Churches of England! Edward III. in 1373, according to Walsingham, took this tone, in a communication with the Pope; and the same writer adds, that the Parliament of England at the same time passed an act that cathedral churches should enjoy the right of free elections, and that the King should not in future interfere with them, by opposing the persons elected by them, and endeavouring to prevent their confirmation. But we must proceed to the Attorney-General's further remarks.

"It appears therefore, my Lords, from that general statement, that the bishops having originally been elected by the people and the clergy; their election having afterwards been limited to the clergy, by reason of the increase of electors; and having then been taken by the Crown; a conflict arose between the Crown and the Pope; the Pope desiring, and in fact insisting upon the right of confirmation, and in that confirmation being, I presume, according to the doctrine of their Church, infallible."

We really beg pardon—but we must relax into a smile at this worthy lawyer's mode of dealing with the facts of ecclesiastical history. There is a curious jumble of chronology in the foregoing. The speaker leaps from the third to the twelfth century—then back again to the sixth or seventh, then forward to the thirteenth and fourteenth; imagining himself all the time to be proceeding on in regular chronological order; and the self-satisfied air of the concluding remark, is really admirable. We certainly never heard before of infallibility attaching to Papal confirmations of bishops—such a claim being generally understood to refer to the decision of questions of doctrine and morals in controversy. But to proceed:

"Ultimately it was compromised by the Charter of King John, granting that bishops shall be canonically elected, he reserving to himself the power of appointing or nominating the person to be elected, and influencing at that time, by his presence, the election that was to take place."

This is a most unfair representation, wholly unwarranted by

the authority quoted. That authority says nothing of any *such* reservation. It simply states that by his Charter King John granted canonical elections “provided leave was asked of him, and *his assent required after such election*”—which implies that he did not reserve any power of recommending persons to be elected; for if he had, his assent to the election could not have been necessary, and especially if the elections were to be conducted in his presence. It is said indeed that “the king retained this ancient prerogative of recommending,” &c.; but it is not said that he retained it by any formal reservation. The Charter in fact excluded it, but the King nevertheless assumed it, and thus violated the Charter.

We now come to a statement of the only ground of public right (except merely that of royal prerogative) which we remember to have seen urged as a foundation for the power of the Crown in appointing to bishoprics. It is thus stated:

“Your Lordships will find the same matter shortly stated in the ‘First Institute,’ chap. 11, fol. 134 *a*. ‘*Episcopus*, a bishop, is regularly the king’s immediate officer to the king’s court of justice in causes ecclesiastical, and all the bishoprics in England are of the king’s foundation, and the king is patron of them all; and at the first they were donative, and so it appears by our books, and by acts of parliament, and by history, and that was *per traditionem annuli et pastoralis baculi*, i. e. the crosier. And King Henry the First, being persuaded by the Bishops of Rome to make them elective by their chapter or convent, refused it. But King John by his Charter acknowledging the custom and right of the Crown in former times, yet granted *de communi consensu Baronum*, that they should be eligible, which after was confirmed by divers acts of parliament.’”

We here find the patronage of the sees of England claimed for the Crown on the ground of its foundation of the bishoprics. This is a clear ground of right as far as it extends. If it can be established it infers the right of the English sovereigns under certain conditions to appoint bishops, though not with any absolute and arbitrary authority, irrespective of the Church’s consent.

We purpose to examine this alleged claim in the first instance, reserving the question of mere prerogative for after consideration.

Now, on this claim of foundation, two questions arise. In the first place, How far were all episcopal sees in England exclusively founded by the Crown? And, secondly, If they were founded by the Crown, did such a fact imply necessarily the right of patronage in the Crown? We purpose to answer these questions successively.

With reference to the former question, we must refer some-

what to history; and omitting, as regards the English Church, the earlier and more fabulous portion of her history, we will commence with the period of Gregory the Great, when the sees of Canterbury and York were founded, and the Anglo-Saxon Church commenced.

CANTERBURY.—We shall take the see of Canterbury in the first place. It appears, from Venerable Bede, that this see was founded by authority of Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, and that the English sovereigns had nothing to do with its foundation.

Venerable Bede (i. 23), having described the mission of certain monks by Pope Gregory for the purpose of effecting the conversion of England, adds that, while on their journey, they became fearful of undertaking the enterprise before them, and sent back to Pope Gregory, Augustine, whom *he* had appointed to be ordained bishop, "*quem eis episcopum ordinandum si ab Anglis susciperentur disposuerat.*" We next find (i. 25) Augustine in the character of abbot, accompanied by his monks, landing in Kent, and received favourably by King Æthelbert, who, after his baptism (c. 26), granted to the Abbot and monks a residence in Canterbury, and various possessions, "*Nec distulit, quin etiam ipsis doctoribus suis locum sedis eorum gradui congruum in Duroverni Metropoli sua donaret, simul et necessarias in diversis speciebus possessiones conferret.*"

This endowment was given to the monks in common. There is not the slightest mention of any endowment of a bishopric, or a foundation of one, by the royal authority.

The very next passage (c. 27) states, that, in the mean time, that is, even *before this endowment had been made by the Crown*, Augustine was consecrated *Archbishop to the nation* of the Angli by Ætherius, Archbishop of Arles, according to the directions of Pope Gregory: "*Interea vir Domini Augustinus venit Arelas, et ab Archiepiscopo ejusdem civitatis Ætherio, juxta quod jussa sancti patris Gregorii acceperant, Archiepiscopus genti Anglorum ordinatus est.*" There is not a single word as to the foundation of the see by the King. Augustine was made bishop simply by the authority of Pope Gregory.

Shortly afterwards (c. 29) we find Gregory sending to Augustine the pall, and giving him direction to ordain twelve bishops, to be subject to his authority; the Bishop of London to be ever after consecrated by his own synod, and to receive the pall; and also to consecrate as Bishop of York, to be metropolitan over twelve bishops, *whomsoever he may judge fit*: "*ita ut per loca singula duodecim episcopos ordines, qui tuæ subjiciant ditioni . . . Ad Eburacam vero civitatem te volumus episcopum mittere, quem ipse judicaveris ordinare; ita duntaxat, ut si eadem civitas cum fini-*

timis locis verbum Dei receperit, ipse quoque duodecim episcopos ordinet, et metropolitani honore perfruatur."

It is obvious from this, that the whole power of constituting bishoprics in those times was in the ecclesiastical authority, and not in the temporal. And this, perhaps, will be sufficient to show that the Crown has no claim to be considered as the sole founder of the see of Canterbury.

YORK.—The first Archbishop of York was Paulinus, who was appointed and ordained Bishop by Justus, Archbishop of Canterbury (Bede, ii. 9), according to the directions of Pope Gregory, and accompanied the daughter of the King of Kent, who was espoused to Edwin, King of Northumberland. The appointment of this Bishop for the kingdom of Northumberland, was thus the act of the ecclesiastical power. The King was afterwards converted to Christianity, and he then gave to Paulinus the seat of his bishopric at York. "*In qua etiam civitate ipse doctori atque antistiti suo Paulino sedem episcopatus donavit.*" That is to say, he recognised the episcopal authority of Paulinus in his dominions, and erected a church to be the seat of his episcopate. Such appears to be the meaning of the passage when compared with similar passages in Bede (see ii. 3).

LONDON and ROCHESTER.—Of the foundation of the sees of London and Rochester, we read as follows. In 604 (Bede, ii. 3), Augustine ordained Mellitus Bishop of London, in which city King Ethelbert built a church as a place for the episcopal see; and Justus was also ordained by Augustine as Bishop of Rochester, where a church was erected by the same prince; and many gifts were made to the bishops of both churches by the King *and the Archbishop*. In the case of these sees, the Crown was certainly not the *sole* founder, to say the least.

The see of DUNWICH, in East-Anglia, was founded in 631, where Bishop Felix, who had been born and ordained in Burgundy, having expressed to Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, his wish to preach in East-Anglia, was commissioned by him, and subsequently received the seat of his episcopate in the city of Dumnoc or Dunwich (Bede, ii. 15). There is not any evidence that the sovereign was the sole founder of this see, or indeed that he founded it at all. Felix, as we learn from the context, promoted the wishes of Sigebert, King of East-Anglia, in preaching Christianity; but there is no evidence that the latter was the founder of the see of Dumnoc.

In the foundation of the see of LINDISFARNE, A.D. 635, the co-operation of the ecclesiastical with the temporal power in the foundation of the episcopate is clear. It is stated by Bede, that Oswald, King of Northumberland, desiring that his people should

be converted to Christianity, applied to the Scots, requesting "that a bishop might be sent to him," and accordingly Aidan was immediately commissioned, to whom the King, at his own request, gave the island of Lindisfarne as the place of his episcopal see (Bede, iii. 3).

Another see was founded in 635 through the efforts of Birinus, who was consecrated bishop by desire of Pope Honorius, and came into England to preach amongst the heathen. This bishop having converted and baptized the King of Wessex, was granted by him the city of DORCHESTER, to establish his episcopal see there: "*Donaverunt autem ambo reges eidem episcopo civitatem quæ vocatur Dorcia, ad faciendum inibi sedem episcopalem.*" (Bede, iii. 7.) The only circumstance here mentioned, appears to amount simply to the endowment of the see by the Sovereign. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that any thing further was done by the Sovereign, or that he alone pretended to establish the bishopric.

The bishopric of WINCHESTER seems to have been founded in a somewhat irregular way about A.D. 664, when Coinwald, King of Wessex, being dissatisfied with a bishop named Agilbert, whom he had requested to exercise his ministry amongst his people, divided the province into two dioceses, and gave to a bishop named Vini, who had been consecrated in France, an episcopal see at Winchester (Bede, iii. 7).

The next case we meet is the bishopric of the MERCIANS. Penda, son of Peada, King of Mercia, A.D. 653, having embraced the Christian religion, at the court of Northumberland, brought away with him four presbyters to preach to his people, one of whom was ordained by Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, as Bishop for the Mercians and Middle-Angli (Bede, iii. 21). There is no allusion to any foundation of a see by the sovereigns.

The bishopric of the EAST-SAXONS arose in this way. Sigbert, King of Essex, having received the Christian faith about A.D. 653, requested of the King of Northumberland Christian teachers for his people. He sent two presbyters, who preached with great success among the East-Saxons. After some time, Cedd, one of these presbyters, went to visit and confer with Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, by whom, assisted by two other bishops, he was ordained Bishop of the East-Saxons: "*Fecit eum episcopum in gentem Orientalium Saxonum, vocatis ad se in ministerium ordinationis aliis duobus episcopis*" (Bede, iii. 22). There is not the slightest evidence that the King had any thing to do with the matter. But we are told that Cedd, having received the rank of the episcopate, returned back again to his province, and fulfilled his ministry as bishop.

The bishoprics of HEXHAM and of LINCOLN were established by Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, in A.D. 678, when he deprived Wilfrid of his see of York, and divided it into three bishoprics (Bede, iv. 12). There is no mention of any act of the King in erecting these new sees.

The bishopric of SELSEY (afterward of Chichester) was established in 681 by Wilfrid, the deprived Bishop of York, who preached the Gospel in Sussex, and was granted the estate of Selsey, where he established a monastery and an episcopal see (Bede, iv. 13).

At a subsequent period, A.D. 909, the three bishoprics of WELLS, BODMIN, and CREDITON were established, the King *and the bishops* having divided the previously existing sees, and their regulation was confirmed by the Pope. (See Guil. Malms. p. 47, an. 904, cited by Thomassin, Benef. i. 58.)

The bishopric of Lincoln was divided, and the see of ELY erected, by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, with consent of the King, and by authority of the Pope (Eadmer, Hist. Nov. cited by Thomassin).

In short there is not an instance, as far as we can see, in English history of the foundation of any see merely by the authority of the State, until the reign of King Henry VIII.—when the six new sees of Gloucester, Chester, Bristol, Westminster, Oxford, and Peterborough, of which only four are now remaining, were established by the Crown under the authority of an act of Parliament, and without the intervention of the spiritual power.

It is observable however, that the fact of such an act of Parliament is a sufficient proof that the Crown is not of itself competent to found bishoprics, and the same principle is established by the subsequent practice up to the present time, for whatever bishoprics have been founded, have not been founded by the Crown, but under the powers given by act of Parliament. From this we may infer that the Crown is not to be held the sole founder of bishoprics; and if it be alleged that the Crown's prerogative has been narrowed and limited in this respect, and that Parliament now gives power to the Crown, which the Crown originally exercised by its own right, it follows that the prerogative of the Crown has been already limited in this respect, and therefore there is no reason why it shall not be limited further, if good reason for so doing can be shown.

To revert to our subject—The bishoprics founded since the time of Henry VIII. have been founded under act of Parliament, and not merely by the Crown. And none of these sees have been endowed by the Crown. The see of Ripon was endowed by the

ecclesiastical commissioners under authority of an act of Parliament. The colonial bishoprics have not been in any case, we believe, endowed by the Crown. Some receive salaries from the public funds, others are supported by endowments; but in no case has the Crown been the sole founder or the endower of these sees. As far as regards the colonial sees and the see of Ripon, the Crown cannot put forward any claim, as the founder, to the perpetual right of presentation.

With reference to the ancient bishoprics the case is somewhat different. They were for the most part, though not exclusively, endowed by the Crown, and in *this* sense the Crown may be considered their founder. There is another sense in which the term may be taken, as implying the *sole and exclusive* establishment of bishoprics by some authoritative act. This was never the case in England. The *Church* in all cases exercised her authority in the establishment of bishoprics, and the Crown confirmed this authority, gave it legal support, and supplied endowments to maintain the bishops independently of voluntary contributions. The way in which bishoprics were in all cases established in the earlier ages of the Anglo-Saxon Church was this:—The ecclesiastical authorities ordained a Missionary bishop for a certain heathen or unconverted country, or else a prince made a request to the ecclesiastical authorities to ordain a bishop for his people. The bishop thus sent forth, if he were received by the monarch and the people, obtained from the sovereign and nobles grants of lands and other property towards the support of himself and his successors, and perhaps had a church built for him. Such was the whole process in founding sees in ancient times.

We have now considered briefly one branch of the question, namely, In what sense the Crown is to be considered as the founder of all episcopal sees. We are now to examine the further question, How far does the qualification of “Founder” give to the Crown the *right* of nominating to episcopal sees?

Now, in the first place, we are not to discuss the question, How far it may or may not be expedient, and fair, and fitting, to give to founders the patronage of sees endowed by them. We are simply considering it as a question of *right*; and looking at it in this point of view, we cannot see any necessity that founders should always possess the right of patronage. We have seen two sees endowed by a private individual, and yet patronage was not reserved. Patronage appears to be in all cases regulated by *agreement*, and limited at the discretion of the Legislature. The right of perpetual patronage is not secured by any Act of Parliament to all persons who may endow churches; and yet, if the principle as applied to the Crown is a matter of right, it must be

equally so in the case of private individuals. As, then, the Legislature does not recognise any such principle in the case of individuals, neither can it in the case of the Crown.

The right of patronage of churches can only be acquired by *covenant* between the parties concerned. It is very possible that the Church might not in all cases wish to receive endowments coupled with the condition of granting the power of nomination. On the other hand, persons endowing might not wish to acquire for themselves or their successors the privilege of nominating. So that, in all cases, the right of patronage must depend on some covenant expressed or implied between the Church and the party concerned.

Now, if such a covenant can be shown to have been expressed or implied in the foundation of English sees; if it can be shown that the sovereigns of England, in granting endowments to the bishoprics, stipulated for the right of perpetual patronage, we are ready to concede that the Crown's right of patronage rests on the basis of its having founded those sees. But for evidence of any such covenant we may look in vain. There is not a tittle of evidence in favour of it. Let it be produced, if there be any evidence in existence. We challenge its production.

We are well aware that there is no such evidence. It is not necessary for us here to enter into the argument on the other side, or to prove that the whole history of the Church shows that no such covenant could have existed, *because it was never acted on*. We will here merely say, again, that the right of the Crown to appoint to bishoprics, depends wholly on covenant with the Church, and that no such covenant can be produced.

It is needless to say that the Crown never could have possessed *in itself* any absolute power of making bishops, because it cannot *consecrate* a bishop. For *that* act it must go to the Church. No Christian sovereign ever did, or could pretend, that he possessed the power of consecrating a bishop; and, until the time of Henry VIII., no law ever gave the prince the power of compelling bishops, under penalty of premunire, to consecrate. It is undeniable that the Statute of Premunire was, for the first time, in the reign of Henry VIII., applied to compel bishops to consecrate royal nominees to sees. At all previous times there was no law compelling consecrations, though the kings of England have sometimes, in virtue of their prerogative, deprived bishops of their temporalities, and banished them for not consecrating such bishops as they had appointed. Still, whether the Church authorities were required by fine, confiscation, or exile, or by the penalties of premunire, to consecrate the king's nominees, the truth is still undeniable, that without such consecration a bishop cannot

be made, and that the Crown does not possess the power of consecrating, and *must* come to the Church to send forth and ordain bishops. Such is the *principle* even of the present law; and as this principle was in full and unfettered operation for centuries after the foundation of the English bishoprics, it follows necessarily, that the Crown in those ages could not have possessed any absolute power of appointing bishops, inasmuch as the Church authorities possessed the power of rejecting the royal nominees, when there were any such persons.

We have said designedly “when there *were* any such persons,” because, as we shall presently see, there were almost no royal nominees to bishoprics for a long series of years. The early history of the English Church in the pages of Venerable Bede show that nominations and elections to bishoprics were not the office of the Crown, but of the Church, *notwithstanding* the endowment of many of the sees by the Crown; and this fact is an argument to prove, that, so far from there being any covenant or stipulation with the Church that the Crown should nominate to vacant sees, there was rather a stipulation the other way, that the *Church* should have the nomination. The facts of the case go to prove the latter claim rather than the former, though we would not be understood as affirming that there was any covenant at all, for we believe there was none.

Let us now consider the actual mode of appointment of the early bishops of the English sees, as recorded in the pages of Venerable Bede.

CANTERBURY.—The first Archbishop of Canterbury was appointed by Pope Gregory the Great. Bede (i. 23) states, that Pope Gregory, in sending his mission to England, had appointed Augustine to be made bishop if the mission proved successful: “Augustinum, quem eis episcopum ordinandum, si ab Anglis susciperentur, disposuerat.” And, accordingly, the mission having been favourably received, we next read (i. 27) that Augustine was consecrated, according to the directions of Pope Gregory: “Interea vir Domini Augustinus venit Arelas, et ab Archiepiscopo ejusdem civitatis Ætherio, juxta quod jussa sancti patris Gregorii acceperant, Archiepiscopus genti Anglorum ordinatus est.” The King had no part in this appointment or ordination.

After this first appointment to the see of Canterbury by Pope Gregory, the archbishops were nominated by their predecessors, or by the bishops of England. The Crown did not appoint: there is no trace of such a right. The letters of Pope Gregory to Augustine give to the latter and his successors, and to the Metropolitan of York when ordained by Augustine, the power of making bishops. These letters assume throughout that the power of

constituting bishops was in the Church. Thus, in reply to a question of Augustine, Gregory says, "he wishes Augustine to ordain bishops in such sort, that they be not remote from each other." "*Fraternitatem tuam ita volumus episcopos ordinare, ut ipsi sibi episcopi longo intervallo minime disjungantur*" (Bede, i. 27). Not a word is said about any other power but that of the archbishop. Again, Pope Gregory gives to Augustine the pallium, that he may ordain twelve bishops, directing that the bishop of London, in future, be ordained by a provincial synod, and that Augustine should send a bishop to York, who, if received, shall also ordain twelve bishops (Bede, i. 29). Not a word, again, about the Crown's right of nomination; the whole appointment being supposed to rest with the archbishop and bishops.

The second archbishop of Canterbury, Laurentius, was appointed by Augustine during his lifetime, and succeeded on his death: "*Successit Augustino in Episcopatum Laurentius, quem ipse idcirco adhuc vivens ordinaverat*" (Bede, ii. 4).

Of Mellitus and Justus the third and fourth archbishops of Canterbury we only read in Venerable Bede, that they successively became archbishops (ii. 7, 8). There is no allusion to any royal appointments or interference of any kind. They had both been ordained by Augustine, and succeeded him apparently in the order of consecration, by mutual agreement and choice.

Honorius, the fifth archbishop of Canterbury, is said by Bede to have been "effectus," or, as some editions say, "electus," after Justus: "*Honorius pro illo est in præsulatum effectus*" [or *electus*], Bede, ii. 18; and was ordained by Paulinus Archbishop of York. There is no allusion to any royal interference.

Deusdedit, the sixth archbishop, was elected: "*Cessante episcopatu per annum et sex menses, electus est archiepiscopus Cathedræ Doruvernensis sextus Deusdedit de gente Occidentalium Saxonum: quem ordinaturus venit illuc Ithamar, Antistes Ecclesiæ Hrofensis*" (Bede, iii. 20). No allusion is made to any rights of the Crown.

On the death of Deusdedit, Oswy king of Northumberland and Egbert king of Kent, having no bishop in their dominions of Roman ordination, and being desirous of having that ordination in preference to the British or Scottish succession, which they regarded as schismatical, chose, "*with the election and consent of the holy Church*" of England, one of the clergy of Canterbury named Wighard, and sent him to be consecrated bishop by the Pope, in order that he might ordain Catholic bishops throughout England: "*Adsumpserunt cum electione et consensu sanctæ ecclesiæ gentis Anglorum virum bonum, et aptum episcopatu presbyterum nomine Wighardum, de clero Deusdedit Episcopi, et hunc antistitem ordinandum Romanam miserunt*" (Bede, iii. 29). Here we must

observe, that not only the king of Kent in whose dominions the archbishopric of Canterbury was, but also the king of Northumberland, who could have no pretence to appoint to the see of Canterbury on the plea of *foundation*, took part in this application ; and, in fact, it appears to have been made in the name of *Oswy*, for the Pope's reply is only directed to him ; thus ignoring any claim on the part of the Crown of Kent to appoint to the see of Canterbury. And further—the nomination was only made “ with the *election and consent* ” of the Church of England. And further—these English kings *petitioned the Pope to send them a bishop of his own choice*, as appears from his reply to *Oswy* (Bede, iii. 29) ; and accordingly, *Wighard* having died at Rome, the *Pope* chose and consecrated *Theodore of Tarsus* the seventh archbishop of Canterbury, who was received with the utmost respect and obedience by the sovereigns and people of England (Bede, iv. 1). So much for the royal powers of nominating to the see of Canterbury in those times !

We now come to *Bertwald* the eighth archbishop, who was *elected* to the see ; and there is no mention of any royal nomination—“ *qui electus est quidem in episcopatum anno Dominicæ incarnationis sexcentesimo nonagesimo secundo* ” (Bede, v. 8).

Tatwin is the latest archbishop of Canterbury mentioned by Bede, and of him it is merely said that he was made archbishop, and consecrated by certain bishops—“ *pro quo anno eodem factus est archiepiscopus vocabulo Tatuini* ” (Bede, v. 23). Here there is no allusion to any royal nomination.

The result then, as regards the see of Canterbury, is, that from the year 595 when that bishopric was founded, and when it was endowed by King *Ethelbert*, down to 731 when *Tatwin* was appointed archbishop, the Crown's alleged right of nomination had never taken effect. The archbishops were either appointed by the Popes, by the archbishops and bishops, or elected by the clergy. There is not a trace of any royal nomination. And hence we infer that the endowment of the see of Canterbury by the Crown of England could not have been accompanied by any covenant with the Church, or any arrangement of any kind, by which the Crown was to exercise a right of nomination ; for it is incredible that this right should have remained unexercised for such a length of time, if it had existed at all. It would be in vain to argue here, that the Crown had voluntarily abstained from exercising its rights, for the question is whether it ever had *any* rights. That it had none—that the endowment of the see of Canterbury was given under the supposition, and with the full understanding that the Church was to nominate her own bishops, according to the rules originally in force in all Churches, is,

we think, so very manifest, that we cannot imagine on what grounds it is possible for the Crown to claim the right of nominating archbishops of Canterbury, as derived from the foundation of the see.

YORK.—In the next place we come to consider the right of the Crown to appoint to the archiepiscopal see of York.

The first archbishop of York, Paulinus, was *appointed*, and consecrated bishop by Justus, archbishop of Canterbury, in 625, according to the directions of Pope Gregory (Bede, i. 29 ; ii. 9).

Paulinus being obliged to retire from the kingdom of Northumberland by wars and commotions, he had no immediate successor at York. But the diocese afterwards became subject to Aidan, bishop of Lindisfarne, who was appointed and ordained bishop by the Scottish Church, at the request of King Oswald, who sent to them to desire the aid of a Christian bishop (Bede, iii. 3). The next bishop of Northumberland, Finan, was also appointed and consecrated at Iona (Bede, iii. 17—25). Colman, the following bishop, was appointed in a similar way (Bede, iii. 25). On his departure, after the conference of Whitby A.D. 664, in which the Roman rules were adopted, he left Tuda as bishop in his place, who had been consecrated in Ireland : “ *Suscepit pro illo pontificatum Nordanhymbrorum famulus Christi Tuda* ” (Bede, iii. 26).

On the death of Tuda, the king of Northumberland, having adopted the Roman rules, and therefore being prevented from sending to Iona for another bishop for his people, chose Wilfrid a presbyter, and sent him to France to be ordained bishop of York. Here occurs clearly, and for the first time, in 664, an instance of royal nomination.

Of the appointment of the next bishop of York, Bosa, who was consecrated by Archbishop Theodore after Wilfrid had been deposed, no particulars are stated (Bede, iv. 12), nor do we see any evidence as to the mode of appointment of the next bishop, John (Bede, v. 3). Wilfrid II. was ordained by John in 718 prior to his own relinquishment of the see ; but it is not clearly stated whether the nomination was by Wilfrid himself, or by the sovereign, or by the clergy (Bede, v. 6) ; yet the language of Bede seems rather to favour the first supposition : “ *Cum præ majore senectute minus episcopatus administrando sufficeret, ordinato in Episcopatum Eboracensis Ecclesiæ Wilfrido presbytero suo, secessit ad monasterium præfatum* ” (Bede, v. 6).

As regards the bishops of York, then, we arrive at the following result. We find the first nominated by the Archbishop of Canterbury ; the second, third, fourth, and fifth, nominated by the monks of Iona, at the petition of the Crown ; the sixth nominated by the Crown ; the seventh and eighth not specified. It is

quite clear that in this case also, there was no covenant at the erection of an episcopal see in the kingdom of Northumberland, that the Crown should have the patronage of it.

LONDON.—Mellitus was ordained by Augustine A.D. 604 to preach to the East-Saxons, whose chief city was London. This province having received the Christian faith, Mellitus was its bishop (Bede, ii. 3). But after some years he was compelled to leave the province, the inhabitants reverting to heathenism.

The next bishop of the East-Saxons was Chedd, who, having preached at the request of the King, was subsequently ordained bishop of the East-Saxons by Finan, bishop of Lindisfarne, and it is clear, from the language of Bede, that it was done without even consulting the king (Bede, iii. 22).

The next bishop, Erconwald, was appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury: "*Tunc etiam Orientalibus-Saxonibus, quibus eo tempore præfuerunt Sebbi et Sigheri, quorum supra meminimus, Earconwaldum constituit Episcopum in civitate Lundinia*" [sc. Theodorus] (Bede, iv. 6). Of his successor Waldhere's appointment, nothing is stated (Bede, xv. 11); and little more than the names of the succeeding bishops is known.

The only three cases in which we have clear evidence as to the mode of appointment exclude the royal patronage. Two bishops were appointed by archbishops of Canterbury, the third by the bishop of Lindisfarne.

DURHAM.—Of the bishops of Lindisfarne, the predecessors of the bishops of Durham, we have already spoken under the see of York. It there appears that Aidan, Finan, Colman, Tuda, were successively bishops of Lindisfarne by election and consecration of the Scottish bishops and monks of Iona. The next bishop of Lindisfarne was ordained by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, and no mention is made of any royal appointment (Bede, iv. 12). But in the appointment of the succeeding bishop, Cuthbert, we have a very plain proof that the Crown had then no power of nomination. Bede states that "a great synod having met in the presence of King Egfrid, near the river Alne, in which Archbishop Theodore presided, Cuthbert was *elected* to the bishopric of Lindisfarne, with perfect unanimity and general consent:" "*Uno animo omniumque consensu ad Episcopatum Ecclesie Lindisfarnensis eligeretur*" (Bede, iv. 28). This appears to be sufficiently conclusive: it took place in 684.

Of the ordination of Eadburt, the next bishop, we only know that there is no allusion to any interference of the Crown (Bede, iv. 29); and the same may be said of the succeeding bishops.

WINCHESTER.—The first bishop of the West-Saxons was Birinus, who, by direction of Pope Honorius, was consecrated a

bishop by Asterius, bishop of Genoa, and preached the gospel amongst the West-Saxons, where he was favourably received (Bede, iii. 7).

Agilbert, a French bishop, on his return from Ireland to France, was requested by the king of Wessex to become bishop, to which he acceded; and in this case we have an instance of the interference of the Crown (Bede, iii. 7). This prince, however, appears to have had notions on the royal authority unusual in that age, for he divided the bishopric without consulting Agilbert, and established Vini, whom he had caused to be ordained in France, as bishop of Winchester (Bede, iii. 7). But Vini also was expelled by this prince ere long.

The next bishop, Leutherius, nephew of Agilbert, was "received honourably by the people and the king, and *they* requested Theodore, then archbishop of Canterbury, to consecrate him as their bishop" (Bede, iii. 7). This is not consistent with the notion of a sole nomination by the Crown; and it probably explains the preceding statements. Of Hæddi, the next bishop, we only read that he was consecrated at London by Archbishop Theodore (Bede, iv. 12), and nothing is stated regarding the consecration of his successor.

We shall not weary the reader or ourselves by entering any further on the details of the appointment of the first bishops of sees in England. We think, however, that from what has been said in reference to the five principal sees, it is evident that for about 140 years after the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon Church, the episcopal sees were not "donative" by the Crown, either by "pastoral staff and ring," or in any other way. The Crown often *asked* for bishops, *received* bishops, and occasionally nominated bishops (though, even in this case, we have reason to believe that it was always with consent of the laity and clergy); but it never conferred bishoprics by mere right of patronage. No particular rule was laid down as to the appointment of bishops. They were constituted in different ways. So that it is perfectly incredible that there could have been any compact or agreement between the Crown and the Church, that, in return for endowments, the State should hold the patronage of episcopal sees. With reference to parish churches, the case is quite different. In the foundation of parish churches, there was a distinct understanding, from the time of Archbishop Theodore, that the patronage of churches should be vested in those who built and endowed them. But the Crown cannot show any such agreement or compact with regard to bishoprics, as it can with regard to parish churches.

Having thus far examined the questions, how far the Crown is the founder of the English sees, and how far the foundation of

sees, if established, proves the right of nominating bishops, we next proceed to consider the ground on which many persons will be disposed to rest the *right* of the Crown to the patronage of bishoprics,—the alleged sacredness and inviolability of the royal prerogative. We trust we do not yield to others in due obedience to the royal prerogative. At the same time, if we are of opinion that the prerogative may in some point require limitation, and that it is capable of limitation by the law of the land; we trust that we are taking no ground except that which has been repeatedly taken by the English nation and its representatives in Parliament.

The royal prerogative has been *frequently* restricted in past times. James I. and Charles I. attempted to do without Parliaments, as our recent sovereigns have attempted to do without Convocations; but the royal prerogative has been restrained in that point. Elizabeth and her successors erected the Star Chamber; but the large prerogatives extending to Church matters, and included in that jurisdiction, have been abolished by Parliament. In the Coventry Act, the Parliament deprived the Crown of the power of pardoning certain persons. By the Toleration Act, and the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the Emancipation Act of 1829, and the Maynooth Bill, and the Charitable Bequests Bill, the Crown's supremacy over all persons in the empire was annulled; and spiritual jurisdictions not derived from the Crown, but from the Pope, and from various sects, were recognised as legal. By the Scotch Act of Union, the Crown is excluded from the power of making peers of Scotland; by the Irish Act of Union, its power of creating peers is limited. By the Cathedral Bill the Crown patronage was reduced, and many benefices in its gift were suppressed. But, what is still more to the point, the royal prerogative, in appointing to bishoprics, had been for more than three hundred years extinguished by law, until it was revived and augmented by King Henry VIII.

Perhaps there never were sovereigns who had higher notions of their prerogatives in the appointment of bishops than William Rufus, Henry I., and Henry II. The contest between the first two and Archbishop Anselm places this matter in the clearest point of view. Banishment from the kingdom, withdrawal from communion with the Pope, and every other species of threat, and even violence, were resorted to, in order to compel Anselm to acquiesce in the royal claim of granting investiture of bishoprics by ring and pastoral staff, which Rufus and Henry I. declared to be their prerogative, and that of their predecessors. The bishops took part with the Crown; and it was earnestly hoped that Anselm would resign his see on finding himself involved in opposition to

the royal prerogative. This, however, he declined to do ; and, being supported by the Church authorities out of England, and especially by the Pope, the issue of the contest, which continued for *twelve* years (from 1095 to 1107), was, that a compromise was effected between the Crown and the Church, by which it was enacted, “ That, for the future, none shall be invested by the king, or by any lay patron, in any bishopric or abbey, by delivery of a pastoral staff and ring ; and none who is *elected* to any prelacy shall be denied consecration on account of the homage that he does to the king.”

It may be here remarked, that it was during the existence of this compromise that the sees of Carlisle and Ely were founded, so that the Crown could not claim the right of granting investiture to bishops of those sees.

Thomas à Becket was *elected* by the monks of Canterbury and the bishops, and, after his death, Roger was *elected* archbishop. Richard, prior of Dover, was next *elected* by the monks and bishops, and approved by the king. Archbishop Baldwin was *elected* by the monks of Canterbury. On his death, A.D. 1191, a letter was sent by King Richard I. to the monks of Canterbury, recommending William, archbishop of Monreale in Sicily, and commanding them to receive him as archbishop. The monks of Canterbury, after due deliberation, *elected* Reginald, bishop of Bath, and installed him as archbishop. Hubert, the next archbishop, was *elected* by the monks of Canterbury, and approved by the bishops of England.

After the death of Archbishop Hubert, the monks, being jealous of any interference with the election of archbishops by the bishops of England, suddenly assembled, and having elected their sub-prior Reginald, sent him to Rome to obtain the approbation of the Pope. Reginald, having broken the oath of secrecy they had imposed on him, they then asked the king's leave to make an election, and elected John Gray, bishop of Norwich, archbishop, who was placed in possession of the temporalities by the king. The bishops protested against both elections, as they claimed a share in the election. The Pope, after examining the case, pronounced the right of election to be vested in the monks only, and then annulled both elections as irregular. After which he caused fourteen monks of Canterbury, then at Rome, to elect Stephen Langton, who was at once consecrated archbishop by the Pope, A.D. 1207.

Throughout all these proceedings, it is quite clear that the Crown did not possess the right of nominating the archbishops.

King John was obliged ultimately to acknowledge Stephen Langton as archbishop ; and, in 1214, he was further obliged to

confirm to the Church the full liberty of electing her own bishops, abbots, and deans, only on condition that the royal licence should be obtained to hold each election, that the Crown should enjoy the custody of the temporalities during the vacancy of the see, and that homage should be done for those temporalities. This restoration of the liberties of the Church was confirmed by the first article of Magna Charta, granted to the barons of England, in 1215, by King John, and which constituted the fundamental law of England. The words of the Charter for the freedom of elections are very remarkable: "John, &c. . . . we have conceded, appointed, and by this our present Charter confirmed, that, henceforth, in all and singular churches and monasteries, cathedral and conventual, of all our kingdom of England, the elections of all prelates whatsoever, both greater and lesser, *be free* in perpetuity, saving to us and our heirs the guardianship of vacant churches and monasteries which belong to us. We also promise that we will neither impede, or permit to be impeded by ours, nor will procure, but that in singular and all the churches and monasteries aforesaid, when they become vacant, the electors may freely set over the prelacy whomsoever they will as pastor; licence of election, however, being first sought from us and our heirs, which we will not refuse or defer. And if perchance (which God forbid) we should refuse or defer, the electors may, nevertheless, proceed to make a canonical election, and our assent be likewise required after the election, which we likewise will not refuse, unless we should have proposed, and lawfully proved, that there is some reason for which we ought not to consent." The original will be found in "Dr. Hampden's Case," p. 125. The confirmation of this Charter in Magna Charta is in these terms: "John, &c. . . . have granted to God, and by this our present Charter have confirmed for us, and *our heirs for ever*: First, that the English Church shall be free, and shall have her whole rights and her liberties inviolate; and I will this to be observed in such a manner, that it may appear from thence that *the freedom of elections*, which was reputed most necessary to the English Church, which we granted, and by our Charter confirmed, and obtained the confirmation of it from Pope Innocent III. before the rupture between us and our barons, *was of our own free-will*. Which Charter we shall observe; and we will it to be observed, with good faith, *by our heirs for ever*."

There can be no doubt that the royal prerogative was diminished by this, and by very many other enactments in Magna Charta. The sovereigns of England had arrogated rights which the nation deemed inconsistent with its liberty; and the encroachments on the liberties of the Church in elections were only parallel

to the general course of infringements on laws and customs. In *Magna Charta* the prerogative of the Crown was restricted, by fixing the rate of reliefs of the heirs of the military tenants of the Crown; by declaring the liberties of the cities and boroughs; by enacting that freemen should not be punished except by judgment of their peers, or by the law of the land; that justice should not be sold; that none should be made judges except persons acquainted with the law; that the legal tribunals should not follow the Court, but be stationary; that amercements should only be by peers, or be reasonable; that the right of pre-emption should be restricted. In these, and other points, as well as by the declaration of the absolute freedom of ecclesiastical elections, the royal prerogative was materially limited and restricted.

If the mere fact that the Crown possesses a certain prerogative, is a sufficient reason to prevent absolutely any interference with that prerogative by the law, we must be prepared to condemn *Magna Charta* in all its most essential features. We must be prepared to condemn the whole subsequent legislation of England down to the present day, which has always been based on *Magna Charta*, and has confirmed it by more acts than can be now enumerated. And, in fine, such a principle would be inconsistent with the legislation of England since the Reformation, which has, as we have already shown, repeatedly limited or diminished the royal prerogative in various respects, and especially in respect to the Church. That the royal prerogative ought not to be diminished without some good reason, we readily admit; but that the royal prerogative should be upheld unlimited, even if sufficient reason should exist for its limitation in some point, is a doctrine altogether inconsistent with the English law and constitution.

We proceed to quote a few of the statutes in which the ecclesiastical liberties recognised in *Magna Charta* were afterwards confirmed, referring to Mr. Stephens's very useful work, "*The Statutes relating to the Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institutions.*"

"Stat. 9 Hen. III. c. 1, A.D. 1225.—'A Confirmation of Liberties.'"

"First, we have granted to God, and by this our present Charter have confirmed, for us and for our heirs for ever, that the Church of England shall be free, and shall have all her whole rights and liberties inviolable."

"Stat. 9 Edward II., St. i. c. 14, A.D. 1315.—'There shall be free elections of dignities of the Church.'"

"Also, if any dignity be vacant, when election is to be made, it is moved that the electors may freely make their election without fear of any power temporal, and that all prayers and oppressions shall in this

behalf cease." *The answer.* "They shall be made free according to the form of statutes and ordinances."

"Stat. 14 Edward III., St. i. c. 1, A.D. 1340.—'A Confirmation of Liberties.'"

"First, that holy Church have her liberties in quietness, without interruption or disturbance."

"Stat. 25 Edwardi III., St. iii. c. 1, A.D. 1350.—'All privileges granted to the clergy confirmed.'"

"First, that all the privileges and franchises granted heretofore to the said clergy be confirmed and holden in all points."

We now come to a very important statute—the Statute of Provisors, passed in 1350, in consequence of the usurpations of the Popes, who pretended to dispose of the bishoprics and other prelacies of England, setting altogether aside the Church's right of free election. By the Statute of Provisors it was represented that the prelacies of England had been founded by the kings *and nobles* of England; that great evils resulted from the Papal usurpation of the appointment to such prelacies; that therefore, it was enacted *that all elections to prelacies should be free* according to law; and that if the Pope presented, in disturbance of such free elections, the king ought to have the collation for that term, because the conditions made when free elections were granted were not kept, and consequently the former rights of the Crown ought to revive. We shall quote a few passages.

"Whereas the holy Church of England was founded in the estate of prelacy within the realm of England, by the said grandfather and his progenitors, and the earls, barons, and other nobles of his said realm, and their ancestors, to inform them and the people of the law of God, &c. . . . and certain possessions, as well in fees, lands, rents, as in advowsons, which do extend to a great value, were assigned by the said founders to the prelates and other people of the holy Church of the said realm to sustain the same charge, &c. . . .

"The Bishop of Rome, accroching to him, the seigniories of such possessions and benefices, doth give and grant the same benefices to aliens, which did never dwell in England, and to cardinals, &c. . . .

"Our Lord the King, seeing the mischiefs and damages before mentioned . . . willing to ordain a remedy for the great damages and mischiefs which have happened and daily do happen to the Church of England by the said cause; by the assent of all the great men and the commonalty of the said realm, to the honour of God, and profit of the said Church of England, and of all his realm, hath ordered and established, *that the free elections* of archbishops, bishops, and all other dignities and benefices elective in England, shall hold from henceforth in the manner as they were granted by the king's progenitors, and the ancestors of other lords, founders of the said dignities and other benefices . . . and in case that reservation, collation, or provision be

made by the court of Rome, of any archbishopric, bishopric, dignity, or other benefice, in disturbance of the free elections, collations, or presentations aforementioned, that at the same time of the voidance, that such reservations, collations, and provisions ought to take effect, our Lord the King and his heirs shall have and enjoy for the same time the collations to the archbishoprics and other dignities elective, which be of his advowry, such as his progenitors had before that free election was granted, since that the election was first granted by the king's progenitors upon a certain form and condition, as to demand license of the king to choose, and after the election to have his royal assent, and not in other manner; which conditions not kept, the thing ought by reason to resort to his first nature."

This act is clearly intended to maintain the right of free elections heretofore conceded by the kings of England, though it claims for the Crown the patronage of the prelacies, in case the conditions made in granting these free elections are not observed. Accordingly we afterwards find the *liberties* of the Church again confirmed.

"Stat. 50 Edwardi III. c. 1, A.D. 1376.—'A Confirmation of the Liberties of the Church.'"

"First, it is ordained and established, that holy Church have all her liberties and franchises in quietness, without impeachment or other disturbance."

"Stat. 1 Richardi II. c. 1, A.D. 1377.—'A Confirmation of the Liberties of the Church, and of all statutes not repealed.'"

"Stat. 13 Richardi II., St. ii. c. 2, A.D. 1389.—'A Confirmation of the Statute of Provisors, &c.'"

"Item, whereas the noble King Edward . . . did ordain and establish that the free elections of archbishoprics, bishoprics, and all other dignities and benefices elective in England, should hold from henceforth and the manner as they were granted by his progenitors, and by the ancestors of other lords founders . . . our Lord the King that now is hath ordained and established," &c. (confirming such elections.)

"Stat. 1 Henrici IV. c. 1, A.D. 1399.—'A Confirmation of the Liberties of the Church, &c.'"

"Stat. 4 Henrici IV. c. 3, A.D. 1402.—'A Confirmation of the Liberties of the Church and Clergy.'"

"Stat. 3 Henrici V., St. ii. c. 1, A.D. 1415.—'A Confirmation of the Liberties of the Church.'"

"Stat. 2 Henrici VI. c. 1, A.D. 1423.—'A Confirmation of the Liberties of the Church.'"

This series of statutes will show sufficiently what the law of England was till the reign of King Henry VIII., A.D. 1533, when the present laws were enacted, and the existing prerogative of the Crown was created.

The state of the case in general then is this. The Crown of England had originally no prerogative of appointing bishops in England. That right was vested in the bishops, clergy, and Church at large. In process of time the Crown acquired, partly by usurpation, the power of interfering in elections, and sometimes even directly nominated to sees. The power of investiture which seems to have arisen at the Conquest, was lost again about A.D. 1107, when it relinquished that power.

It subsequently, in 1214, restored the original rights of the Church in the amplest manner, by conceding free elections, without any interference on the part of the Crown or its ministers.

And this remained the law of the land up to the time of Henry VIII., during ages when the Crown of England was surrounded with glory such as has since perhaps hardly fallen to its lot. In the reign of Henry VIII. the liberty of election guaranteed by so many successive monarchs and Parliaments of England, was extinguished; and the Crown was given the absolute prerogative of nominating to bishoprics, and compelling consecration, which it had never before possessed.

This shows, altogether, that the prerogative of the Crown may *vary* in different ages according to circumstances; and that it may be augmented or diminished by the law of the land. The conclusion, therefore, to which we here arrive is, that it would be very unreasonable to contend that the Crown must necessarily retain the absolute right of nomination to bishoprics, because it now possesses it.

In the preceding pages it has been admitted, that the sovereigns of England exercised a greater or less influence in the appointment of bishops, at various times before the reign of King Henry VIII., though such interference did not take place till after the foundation of the English bishoprics, and was at length suppressed by law for several centuries. It is, however, carefully to be observed, that even where the sovereigns of England *did* interfere in the appointment of bishops, it was not to the exclusion of the regular electors. The Norman sovereigns took part in the election of their archbishops, but the clergy and the bishops *also* took part; and the consecration then remained, which was not compellable by any law, except the exercise of the royal prerogative in banishing those who refused, and confiscating their temporalities. The exercise of this power required great caution in the face of public opinion, and of an ecclesiastical superior so vigilant and so fearless as the Pope. So that the kings of England in those ages, could only succeed in their interference with episcopal nominations, by persuasion and other means of influence over the electors; but they possessed no absolute power themselves.

There was a continual struggle on the part of the Crown to get its own creatures appointed to bishoprics; but it not unfrequently failed in the attempt, and if it lost temper, defeat was sure to follow.

And there is another important feature which should not be lost sight of. The sovereigns who thus interfered in episcopal elections were always of the same faith as the Church itself, and could not in any case be suspected of wishing to promote heresy, or to subvert the faith of the Church. They acted as the principal laymen of the Church, and it was not unreasonable that they should have more or less influence in the appointment of bishops. The sovereign certainly could not be excluded from taking a share in ecclesiastical appointments, when the rest of the laity, clergy, and bishops, all had their parts. The union of Church and State was as perfect in those days, as it has ever been since the Reformation; and infinitely more perfect than it is now.

It is not our purpose to discuss at length the legislation of Henry VIII. on the subject of nomination to bishoprics. There are points in that legislation which appear to be conceived in an arbitrary spirit. The infliction of the penalty of premunire, for instance, on the dean and chapter, for refusing to elect the royal nominee, while, at the same time, the Crown is given the remedy of nominating by letters patent, appears to be a gratuitous piece of severity. But, without entering further into details, we will only say, that, considering the position in which the Church was placed at *that* time; considering that the liberty of election so long supported by the statute law of England, had been infringed by papal reservations, papal confirmations, and royal influence; considering the moral power which the Papacy exercised, and the difficulty of rescuing the elections of the Church of England from the grasp of the Papacy, and restoring them to the rightful hands; considering all this, it is very probable that the nomination of bishops may not have been ill-placed in the hands of the Crown at *that* time. The Reformation could not probably have been carried out, unless this change had been made; and it was doubtless this probability which reconciled the Church generally to the assumption of this power by Henry VIII. and his successors. The royal supremacy and prerogative became one of the chief points of contest between the Reformation and its opponents; and the irregularities or excesses which marked some of its acts or pretensions, were forgotten in the main principle which was connected with them. The sovereign of England was the leader of the anti-papal movement; and it was this, which raised the royal power and prerogative to so great a height, that they almost extinguished the liberties of the people for a time, and

two successful rebellions took place before the royal prerogative was reduced to more moderate dimensions. The "Protestant cause" was the bulwark of the Crown of England for nearly three hundred years: on that cause its prerogative gained ground, its popularity became very great, and the loyalty of the people was almost boundless; but that "Protestant" feeling has gradually decayed. It has died out of the higher classes. It has been discouraged by the State. It has no hold over the masses of the community. It is virtually extinct: and with it the Crown has lost a firm supporter of its Church prerogatives.

We are simply stating *facts* here, not expressing any opinions. The absolute and arbitrary prerogative of the Crown in State matters was put an end to in the seventeenth century; but in Church matters it has continued unaltered to the nineteenth. And it has been the re-action against Romanism, which has sustained that branch of the royal prerogative. Churchmen were very zealous in maintaining the royal supremacy and the royal power against all opponents, because the royal supremacy was the great political safeguard of the Church against the Papacy and against dissent. The State would not tolerate Romanism, because it was inconsistent with the dignity and rights of the Crown of England. Nonconformity was a high crime and misdemeanour against that authority. The one and the other were acts of rebellion against the State. Both absolutely denied the right of the Crown to interfere with their religious opinions and rites, and laughed to scorn the royal supremacy.

The Crown, on the other hand, was firmly united to the Church. It filled the office of head of the Church; had the right of exercising the most extensive jurisdiction over it; could appoint commissioners to expel heretics and schismatics; was held by the Church to possess the sword for the purpose of restraining all evil-doers; acted on this power, by punishing all Nonconformists, and employing none but Churchmen; was most anxious to appoint orthodox, learned, and zealous bishops and deans: *did*, in fact, appoint men of this character. Can it be a matter of surprise that the Church, thus effectively aided and supported by the Crown, should be zealous on behalf of the royal prerogative? Whatever defects there might be in the theory of the law, they were overlooked in its practice, which was so beneficial to the Church.

We are here reminded of a subject which ought, perhaps, to have been alluded to before, but which we may as well speak of at present, though it will cause a slight digression from our argument. We refer to the Crown's prerogative in appointing to *deaneries*. How and why is it that the Crown appoints to dean-

eries? Deaneries were not originally, as far as we remember, ever conferred by investiture. They are amongst those prelacies, to which the right of free election was conceded by King John. They remained free by law till the time of Henry VIII., and we believe that they *continued* free up to within the last ten years, *as far as the law was concerned*. The present dean of Exeter was *elected* by the chapter of Exeter in opposition to the royal nominee; and the case coming before the courts of law, it was determined that he was *lawfully* elected, and that the Crown had no right to appoint. Now, we apprehend, that the deaneries of the old foundation, *i. e.* those founded prior to the time of Henry VIII., were all in the same position. These deaneries are, we believe, as follows:—York, London, Bangor, Wells, Chichester, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Llandaff, Salisbury, St. Asaph, St. David's. No Act of Parliament transferred the right of nominating to these deaneries to the Crown; and yet the Crown's Letter missive was always deferentially attended to by these chapters. At length the chapter of Exeter acted on its legal rights, and the result was, that, in the next Ecclesiastical Bill, the Crown contrived to get a clause inserted, giving to it the patronage of all these deaneries for the future; and this without protest or objection from the Church! It is plain that there could have been no "Church unions" when so great a usurpation took place. Indeed, the legislation of the last fifty years on Church subjects gives evidence of the same want of vigilance on the part of the Church.

And how did the Crown acquire the right to nominate to the deaneries of the *new* foundation? It obtained an Act of Parliament suppressing all monasteries. Several of the cathedral chapters were monastic. They were therefore suppressed along with the other monasteries. The Crown founded them again as chapters of prebendaries, and reserved the right of presentation in the charters of foundation.

Now this was, we contend, a very unfair mode of proceeding. These cathedrals had been founded by the Crown and the nobles of England originally, without any reservation of patronage. They included secular clergy as well as monks, till the time of Dunstan. The secular clergy were then expelled. Still the law gave to the Crown no power of nominating their superiors. It expressly prohibited any such attempts from the time of King John. Henry VIII., in altering the constitution of these cathedrals, and restoring the secular clergy to the exclusion of the monks, had no more right, morally, to seize the patronage, than had his predecessors in the time of Dunstan, when the form of the chapters was altered. He was not *really* the founder of these

chapters, *i.e.* he did not grant to them endowments out of the Crown lands, but merely gave back to them that which the chapters had always possessed, and which could only have been confiscated in their case, in the intention of restoring it again. In this way, however, the law of the land, as regarded the free elections of deans, was set aside; while the *influence* of the Crown prevailed over the law in the case even of all the deaneries of the old foundation. The whole case furnishes an additional evidence of the disposition of the Crown to grasp powers which are not given to it by law.

We certainly think that the Crown has no moral right to appoint to the deaneries of the new foundation; and if it had, the course of proceeding by which the right of free election has been usurped from the *old* chapters, appears sufficient to annul any moral claims arising from the foundation of the new deaneries.

After this digression on deaneries, we now revert to the leading subject.

We have remarked, then, that the Church acquiesced, and, on the whole, rightly acquiesced, in the somewhat exorbitant power of the Crown in respect to the appointment of bishops given to Henry VIII., because that power was most laudably and beneficially exercised, with a clear and manifest view to the welfare of the Church, and always under the control of public opinion.

With William III., however, a new policy came in. The royal prerogative was constrained to yield to the acknowledgment and toleration of dissent, thereby relinquishing the claim to supremacy over all the nation in points of faith. The episcopal appointments immediately began to partake of the latitudinarian character of the State policy, and thus commenced the "High Church" and "Low Church" divisions, of which the former asserts the rights of the Church, and the latter subjects them to the State's policy. The object of the State was to break down the former, and by the persevering exercise of patronage, combined with the remains of the Protestant feeling in its favour, it succeeded to a great extent. There was much danger to faith when men like Hoadly were appointed to bishoprics; but the power of the Church was greatly weakened by the secession of the non-jurors, whose cause was eminently unpopular; and men were not prepared at that crisis to examine the rights of the Crown, or to unite in any claim for justice. The law and practice of two centuries, approved by so many eminent divines of the Church, possessed so much authority, that it could only be expected that men would by slow degrees, and very reluctantly, open their eyes to the real state of things.

Thus matters proceeded, appointments to bishoprics and other

inferior prelacies (we use the old language on this subject) had gradually ceased to be made, except on political considerations, with an occasional exception ; when, in 1828 and 1829, the State at length proclaimed the admission to political power, and to all its offices, of persons of all creeds and denominations : and thus relinquished at once its union in faith with the Church of England. Not satisfied with tolerating all religious sects, it extends to them the same favour and encouragement which it extends to the Church ; and limits itself, at the very utmost, even in theory, to protect the Church from positive and direct injury by them.

Nor is this merely a matter in which theory and principle have been altered, but the actual working of the State has proved increasingly, that from the year 1828, the State is no longer a "Church of England" State. It is needless now to go into details on this, or to remind the reader of facts which have shown each year a steady progress of principles and of enactments, dangerous to the Church, subversive of her rights, prejudicial to her interests, insulting in their tone, contrary to her discipline, and perilous to her faith. Can any one, possessed of common sense and ordinary penetration, look on the position of the Church in England and in Ireland, as it has been altered by the legislation of twenty-two years, and not see that the State is no longer a "Church of England" State ?

This is really no mere matter of theory, no conjuring up of imaginary evils · the facts are too plain. In every possible way the Church has suffered. In England she has experienced a blow, the effects of which will not be seen for some years : nearly half her property has been swept away by the repeal of the Corn-Laws. This is merely one instance.

The conclusion, then, to which our argument comes is this. The Church is bound to consider the altered character of the State, as bearing on the security of her most essential principles and of the faith entrusted to her ; and she can no longer remain satisfied with the state of the law, which gives to the Crown the *absolute* power of nominating to bishoprics and deaneries, without consulting the opinions and wishes of the Church.

From what has been said, it appears that originally the Crown possessed no right of nominating to bishoprics and deaneries ; that it afterwards acquired influence in the elections, without ever being absolute and uncontrolled ; that it afterwards was obliged for centuries to recognise the most ample and unlimited freedom of election ; and that all this took place, even while the Crown possessed vast power, which it has since lost, and while it and all its subjects were in the most entire agreement with the Church's faith. We have seen that the present law,

by which all the old freedom of election was destroyed, was enacted at a time when the Crown was still in harmony with the Church (at least, when the *Church of England* holds that it was so), and that ever since, up to 1828, the power of the Crown has been in "Church of England" hands.

We know not in whose hands the nomination of bishops is now placed. We only know that it is *not* in the sovereign of the country. It has long ceased to be so, except in theory. It has descended to the ministers, and they are under the influence of other members of the legislature. So that it is impossible to say by which of the religious denominations included in Parliament, the appointment of bishops may be most influenced; or how far it may be intended to promote this or that line of policy, or this or that view of religion. In short, the appointment of bishops is now so circumstanced, that there is no kind of security for the appointment of bishops who are sound in the faith.

The latitudinarian views prevalent amongst statesmen and politicians,—the general spirit of the age,—the character of recent appointments in the Church,—and the principles avowed by the Government, and by many other influential persons, on occasion of an opposition being offered to the appointment of a bishop of questionable faith,—are all signs of what is before us. In a few years we may have our episcopal bench filled with open latitudinarians, or concealed heretics; with men whose only claim consists in their having assailed the principles on which all faith rests. We may have the advocate of Erastianism in its most offensive forms,—we may have the advocate of German infidelity,—we may have the philosophizing divine, who saps and undermines the creeds and formularies of the Church, and finds in them nothing but bigotry and false philosophy,—selected on account of their demerits, and consecrated by an obedient episcopate under the terrors of the law of premunire, to carry out the design of "liberalizing the Church," by subverting its distinctive principles.

Is it not manifest that, in exact proportion to the unfitness of any person to be a bishop, as regards his religious views, is his popularity with the more influential portion of the political world? If any clergyman be supposed unsound in his faith, or if he have assailed the faith of the English Church, his appointment as a bishop is acceptable in the highest degree to the more active and influential spirit of the age. If such appointment be viewed with alarm by the Church of England as tending to endanger her faith, the State, and all its influential members, feel themselves bound to trample down all opposition, and to assert the *absolute* right of the temporal power to appoint whom it pleases to be bishops, without any check or control.

We see the course of events very plainly before us. The Church is justly dissatisfied at several of the proceedings of the State, and is evidently looking with increasing jealousy and watchfulness on what is going on.

She is becoming awake to her real position, and a considerable number of her members are resolved to exert themselves for the purpose of maintaining her faith, wherever they consider it endangered. The State is embarrassed in its policy by this course of proceeding. It was never very well inclined to "High Church" men, and it now *hates* them. It will employ its rights of patronage to put them down: it will promote persons who will carry out its own latitudinarian and semi-infidel views. It will discourage, insult, and forcibly bear down all that part of the Church which adheres firmly to its faith, and is prepared to oppose all attempts to tamper with it. Hence it is clear that appointments of the most exceptionable characters are likely to occur. "Evangelicalism" is the least evil to be apprehended.

And yet, with the full perception of this before us—do we recommend Churchmen to retire from the contest, and to leave the interests of their religion to the care of a State which has ceased to possess any distinctive religion? There can be but one answer. There is no choice here. The Church has, before now, prevailed, when there were greater odds against her, and when she was just as much divided as she is now. She has entered on the task of obtaining securities for her faith, and from that task she cannot retire without withdrawing from the cause of GOD.

The claim, then, which the Church has a right to urge is, for some sufficient security, that the appointment of bishops and of deans shall be restricted to men who possess some merit to recommend them, and who are of sound faith; and who are judged by the Church, after due inquiry, to possess such qualifications.

Although the State has ceased to be of the same faith as the Church, still all that it seems strictly necessary to have is, the *absolute* power of veto on State appointments, either on the ground of want of sufficient merit, or of unsatisfactory religious opinions. That power of rejection ought to be placed in some body representing the Church only, and not under the influence of the State. The power of objecting at the confirmation of bishops appears to us insufficient to meet what is wanted. It would not, we think, secure us against the appointment of *secret* heretics and unbelievers, whose unsoundness might be *suspected* only, and who might yet be appointed with a distinct understanding of their principles by the State. It would not secure us from the decision of complaisant archbishops, unwilling to offend the Government and to take an unpopular course. It would compel strict legal proof for every.

thing. It would put the candidate merely on the defensive, and would not elicit from him any positive declaration or profession of faith, which might be very necessary in some cases. If the archiepiscopal confirmation could be modified so as to avoid these objections; if it could become, as it was originally, a confirmation by a provincial synod of bishops; if it included an examination and profession of faith; if it guarded, even in some degree, against Crown influence on the bishops themselves, by the addition of freely elected clergy; then we might see sufficient security in an archiepiscopal confirmation. But otherwise we should prefer some body, elected in part by the bishops and representing them, and in part by the parochial clergy of the diocese, and invested with the fullest power of veto, until some person was found mutually satisfactory both to State and Church. We think that this might precede any formal appointment by letter missive or patent, so as to leave the law as it now stands, each person being proposed by the Crown to the Church for approbation, before actual appointment is made.

Very possibly some of our readers may be disposed to see difficulties in the way of this arrangement. We do not propose it as the most desirable plan; and, in truth, there are various plans which might be adopted, and with as much advantage to the Church. The details of any arrangement would however be easily arranged. The real difficulty which is before us, is the resolution of the State to keep all the patronage it can, and without permitting the slightest interference from others. This must be expected; and if any resistance be offered, or any opportunity be given to the State for striking a blow, there can be no doubt that it will be done with hearty good will. We think, however, that the claims of the Church should be made *boldly*; and while we have above suggested what might possibly be accepted by the Church *if offered by the State*, we are not disposed to recommend so moderate a claim in the first instance. The Church should, we think, seek for the restoration of *the freedom of elections* as recognised by the ancient laws of England, and reiterate her claims in the face of every opposition that may be raised. We would have her *claim* the amplest liberty, though she might possibly accept, *by compromise*, a *somewhat less* measure of it. We maintain that she has a perfect moral right to free election, and we should not think it wise to demand *less* than her rights.

We shall, however, have a desperate opposition to the restoration of those rights.

We believe that neither William Rufus nor Henry I. were one whit more resolved to keep their Church patronage than are the ministers of the present day. But we believe, that as powerful

gs have been forced ere now to give up their prerogative to inacious opposition, so ministers may be obliged, by a steady unceasing course of agitation, keeping within the limits of the to come to terms at last. The two last appointments to eries are additional proofs offered by Government of their asiness at the opposition offered by the sounder part of the rch to their measures. Facts like this prove, that it is no gnificant movement which the Church is now making.

n conclusion, we have to meet an objection which some persons raise to the discussion of the rights of the Crown in this re-t. It may be said that the canons of 1603 require all the gy to observe and cause to be observed all laws made for re-ing to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the Church; that they denounce excommunication against those who im-sh any part of the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes ored to the Crown; and hence it may be argued, that it is for-len to seek for any alteration in the laws on this subject. But an interpretation as this would be evidently mistaken, for Church could never have intended to prevent the State from ing alterations in the laws, should it be necessary so to do.

State, in fact, has taken from the Crown the power of erecting urt of ecclesiastical commission for the trial of heresy; and lace such an interpretation on the canons, would be to con-n the State for so doing, and to infringe on its liberties. It d only be the intention of the canon to maintain obedience rding to the laws—to the laws actually in force—and not to lude the State from further legislation on the subject, or to ent the clergy and laity from seeking improvements in the by the legislature, whenever they may be deemed necessary.

ART. III.—1. *Democracy and its Mission.* By M. GUIZOT. 1848.

2. *The Causes of the Success of the English Revolution, 1640-1688.* By M. GUIZOT. 1850.

3. *The Revolution in France, a warning to England.* 1848.

IN our last number we asked a question of our Radical contemporaries, What is meant by progress? They tell us continually "to move on," and they must not be surprised if we ask them where we are going. "Lord John Russell is a man behind his times," says a popular writer; "he cannot keep pace with the intelligence of the day: he does not understand the rights and liberties of a great and intelligent people. We, who understand matters, are in advance of the times. We can anticipate popular improvement." Now all this sounds well, and catches the ear of the unwary. Progress there certainly is, and a progress which we cannot arrest,—it is the greatest progress of all, which some of our contemporaries altogether overlook, the progress of man to eternity. Man is but a short time here, his time of probation is diminishing every day, and he is advancing rapidly to death and judgment. This is the personal progress which all must make, whether they will or no, and in comparison of this all political or intellectual progress is of no value. But there is also a social progress, a growth in society, and here the advances of modern days have tended in a great degree to break down the ancient distinction of rank; but legitimate progress, while it tends to bring mankind to a level, does so, not by injuring one for the benefit of many, but by serving all, though perhaps in different degrees. Let us consider the effects of the great modern innovator upon ancient usage, the steam-engine. In old times the nobleman went out on his journey with four long-tailed black horses, and reached his destination, after a remarkably quick journey of six miles an hour for two or three consecutive days. The peasant was then obliged to make the same journey on foot, and might expect to reach his destination after a week's fatigue, occasionally relieved by himself by a few troublesome miles in a stage waggon; might naturally have looked with envy upon the owner of a handsome equipage as it passed him upon the road, and he might have felt what a vast difference there is between the poor and the rich. Now, however, prince, peer, and peasant meet on

the platform. The same train, impelled by the same giant force, carries each to his destination with equal speed. The same tunnel opens for all, and the same terminus receives them together. The nobleman leaves his first class carriage, congratulating himself upon the easiness of his journey; he never objects to the fact, that his humble dependent has received a similar accommodation, and a slight salute upon the platform is a sufficient recognition of the difference of rank. Now this is real progress. All parties are gainers, the poor man perhaps in a tenfold degree beyond the prince, but still the prince has gained enough to make him feel grateful to the inventor, and to lead him to say what a wonderful advantage is afforded by the successful application of science. Now we should consider ourselves as living in our times, if we were to prefer the heavy travelling carriage of the last century to a modern first class, merely because a third class carriage can be attached to the same engine. We should as little wish to throw our fellow-subjects back upon stage wagons, as we should desire to avail ourselves of the accommodation of a fast coach, which could actually reach York in four days. Our modern advocates of progress would break the nobleman's carriage without providing a better mode of travelling, and because they themselves could only afford to pay the price of a stage cart, would object to their neighbour having money to ensure him a better conveyance.

"It is unfair," says the luxurious socialist, Eugene Sue, "for a man to have superfluities while his neighbour is in want of necessities." The nobleman must, therefore, on this principle, descend from his carriage because his neighbour is obliged to do so.

Again, men are behind their times when they do not act up to what they see to be real improvements. We have heard of a club of country farmers who every year subscribed for a prize to be given at a ploughing match. The prize was won for three years by the holder of the only iron plough, which was then new to them. Instead of introducing iron ploughs, to compete with a man in advance of his times, they passed a resolution that no iron plough should be allowed to enter the lists, and that the prize should be confined to the wooden ones of the old fashion. Here the love of old fashions clearly marred the benefit intended to the institution; whatever is done best should be imitated; the object of a farming society, on Lord Bacon's principles, is not to play the skill of a good workman with bad instruments, but to have the work done in the best possible style. He who increases the crop is a benefactor to all, and he who points out the best way of doing it, promotes legitimate progress. A Radical would

be disposed to break the iron plough, because it interfered with the rights of the people ; that one man should be better off than his neighbours; a Socialist would seize upon the overplus of crop provided by superior workmanship ; a high Tory might propose it as an innovation upon established custom, but we cannot sympathize with any of these. Let us by all means progress where all are to gain, and let the husbandman and labourer be first partaker of the fruits. Let us however return to the question, whither does the progress of radicalism tend? The answer is to infidelity, insecurity, and tyranny. Perhaps the best exposition of radical theories is to be found in the writings of Rousseau ; he has carried out his opinions to their full length and honestly explained them ; and his works have had a most decided influence over France ever since their first publication. His idea is that the will of man is supreme ; he objects to a representative government because no man can fetter his own will when he has elected his representative, he has delegated his powers to him, but as his will may change immediately after, the nominee ceases properly to represent him.

“ ‘ The will,’ says Rousseau, ‘ does not admit of being represented. If it is the same, or it is different, there is no medium.’ Since man’s will is the sole legitimate source of his power over himself, how can he delegate that power to another? can he cause his will to reside away from him? He would then create not a representative but a master. All representation then is deceitful, and all power based on representation is tyrannical ; for liberty consists in the sovereignty over ourselves, and man is only free in so far as he obeys no other will than his own.

“ The consequence is unavoidable, Rousseau was wrong but in a certain respect, he did not carry his argument far enough, had he carried it to its full extent, he must have declared the unlawfulness of every durable law and of all permanent power. What does it signify if a law receives my sanction yesterday, if to-day my will has changed? Can I ever exercise my will once? Does my will exhaust its authority by a single act? and as this is the sole master that I am bound to obey, must I submit for the rest of my life to the slavery of obeying those laws by which the master who made them commands me to liberate myself?

“ Such is the tendency of this principle in its full extent. Rousseau either did not perceive or durst not look upon it. It is destructive of all government, nay, more, of all society ; it does not permit a man to contract any engagements nor bind himself to any law, and carries the seeds of dissolution even into the bosom of each individual, since he can no more bind himself to himself than to another ; for his by-gone will that is his will which has had its exercise, possesses no more authority over him than the will of any other person. Rousseau indeed observes ‘ It is absurd that the will should fetter itself with chains for the future.’ ”—*Democracy*, p. 33.

It is clear that if the will of man is to be his only rule, and that will may change ; if all men are equal, and that equality such that no man or number of men can bind an individual, we come at once to savage life, or rather to the life of the wild beasts ; for all savage tribes recognise some authority. Rousseau, though he preferred savage life, saw, that as mankind had attained to a degree of civilization, he could not expect them at once to adopt the habits of Nebuchadnezzar ; he therefore attempts to lead us to the system of small and independent states. In these, if we understand him aright, every citizen should be free to live as he pleases, and each should have a voice in the deliberations of the commonwealth. We see this system tried in the States of Greece ; but we find at once that it leads to the loss of liberty by some, and to the practice of oppression by others. Lycurgus found Sparta in this state : he saw that physical force must prevail in the end, he therefore enacted a code of laws which should make the Spartans the strongest soldiers in Greece. To this object he sacrificed the lives of the infirm, the honesty of the men, and the modesty of the women. The Lacedemonians had the pre-eminence in foreign wars, but at home their domestic system was a tissue of miserable barbarity. Their youths and maidens suffered alike :

Θεινόμεναι βουπλήγι ὑπ' ἀνδροφόνοιο Λυκούργου.

But while Lycurgus provided that Sparta should be able to assert her own freedom, he had no idea of extending the blessings of liberty to any other state. Whatever may have been his patriotism, philanthropy never entered into the number of his virtues. Sparta might prosper, but all her neighbours must be in subjection. The city of Helos had quite as good a right to freedom as Sparta ; but, being weaker for war, its inhabitants were reduced to the vilest slavery. The degradation of the Helots is proverbial, and the stronger city soon trampled on the weaker. Thus it must always be where there is no ultimate appeal to recognised authority ; where physical force alone is to prevail ; and where the will of fallen man is to be the dominant power.

Radicals of the present day appeal to what they call moral force. They assert that public opinion and the decision of the majority are to rule. But this is only because, at present, physical force is against them. The army, with its overwhelming power of military engines, is, they know, an insuperable barrier against any attempt at insurrection ; but the moment these are withdrawn, we shall see what progress our radical neighbours will make, and how soon they will call for the law which arises from the will of the most powerful. One feature in modern progress is, to cry down the army and navy of England, to talk of their great expense, and

the advantages of peaceful negotiation ; but we believe that these very attempts to depreciate the strength of the executive government are only symptoms of what our reformers really desire ; and that, if the physical restraints were removed, they would be quite ready to cry out for the rights of gunpowder and barricades.

Moral force, in the radical sense of the word, is a mere change of name. It substitutes the will of the majority for the rule of one, or of a regular government. Now a majority can never be said really to govern, public opinion may elect a leader, but this is all ; the leader then assumes the place which the majority has given him, and thus, if he be unjust or tyrannical, the will of the majority is represented by him ; but even if we can suppose that a majority could govern a country without delegating their authority, there is nothing to prevent them becoming quite as tyrannical as any individual. On this point M. Guizot says—

“ Let then the sovereignty of the number renounce these vain subterfuges, and let it consent to stand forth such as it is in reality, the absolute power of the majority over the minority ; in other words, a tyranny.”—*Democracy*, p. 47.

The object of the pamphlet, third on our list, is to assert this principle, the right of numbers to rule ; to show that reform has made the middle classes our rulers, instead of the aristocracy, and that a new measure ought to transfer this sovereignty to the people. The author thus writes :—

“ What is termed civilization is the advance, not of the human race, but of certain portions of it. A constant element of all civilization has been the subservience of the majority to the minority. In the despotism of the East, the slavery of the ancient European republics, the serfdom of feudal Europe, the artisan and peasant system of the present day, we find this element ever present—the very foundation of the social scheme. The great majority of the human race are but servants, bound over under heavy penalties (of actual coercion, or the fear of starvation) to do the will of the remaining few. And so burdened are they by the requisitions of this will, that no time is left them for ministering to any but their mere animal wants. Now there is nothing in human nature to countenance this arrangement. The prince is not more, the peasant is not less than man. What then but a violation of nature is the difference of their lots ? if the prince have right done him by society, it cannot be but the peasant have foul wrong. Nor can any assertion of the contrary avail, as long as it is true that human nature is one.

“ Now so long as society upholds the principle that any class of men is worthy of more respect than human nature itself, misery, uneasiness, danger must be the consequences ; for nature is stronger than human institutions, and will prevail. The problem, therefore, for future civilization to solve is, how can man be made what nature points out he

should be? We must no longer rest satisfied with raising barriers to protect one class against the inroads of another. This is but giving strength to wrong. Wherever a class thus acts on the defensive, it is conscious of the possession of exclusive privileges. These indeed are what constitute it a class; but no man, or set of men, has a right to the possession of exclusive privileges. The common rights of humanity, as they are the highest that can be enjoyed, so they are the only rights that can be enjoyed without injustice and oppression."—*Preface to the Revolution in France, a Warning to the Aristocracy and Middle Classes of England.*

Now all these theories of progress from Rousseau to the present day arise from two false assumptions, the natural equality and the perfectibility of man. The Scripture plainly asserts that men must labour, and denies that they are naturally equal. When there were but two of the human race, Eve was put in subjection to Adam; and out of the first two in the second generation, God Himself asserts the natural superiority of Cain to Abel—"Unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." Cain forfeited his birthright by his sin, and Seth was appointed to supersede him, but still in each case the inferiority of one party is plain. The idea of social equality has no doubt been countenanced by Christianity, its advocates have found arguments in its favour, from the fact that religion teaches us that in one sense all are equal—we mean, as before God. All lines from any points on this earth to a fixed star are considered equal and parallel, because the distance is immense, but the astronomer, who would tell us that for this reason Exeter and New York are equidistant from London, would only be considered as a fool. So while Christianity brings all men to a level, as sinners equally responsible, and equally requiring pardon, it also teaches that God has placed one man above another, and that the powers that be are ordained of God. But let democrats reason as they will upon the equality of man, it is a point to which they can never practically attain, because it is contrary to the ordinance of God. Let us try an extreme case. Perhaps the triumph of equality is to be found in a Parisian club of Socialists. These gentlemen deny the right of their neighbours to hold property, and assert the rights of labour, that each ouvrier has a right to work as he will, and be supported at the public expense; yet we see them constantly disobeying the precept of their founder, and fettering the freedom of their own will. They enter into a solemn engagement to vote for the candidate whom the majority shall sanction, "even if the name of Louis Philippe himself should issue from the urn;" now to gain a majority there must be influence, and influence with numbers is one great test of superiority. It is perhaps the first

step to royalty. If all the members of the club be equal to-day, before a week has passed, one or two leaders must arise among them, and these are obliged to give way one by one until the club has elected a dictator. The member who has the most influence thus becomes the king for the time being, and those who are foremost in denying the rights of kings, are obliged to find a leader among themselves.

Again, modern theorists evidently hold the perfectibility of man, that he can make such progress that he shall always improve.

“ But what is man in his own proud esteem ?
Hear him himself the poet and the theme :
A monarch clothed with majesty and awe ;
His mind his kingdom, and his will his law ;
Grace in his mien, and glory in his eyes ;
Supreme on earth, and worthy of the skies ;
Strength in his heart, dominion in his nod,
And, thunderbolts excepted, quite a god.”

Comper.

Now, these assertions are clearly the voice of infidelity to which modern progress must lead ; they amount to a denial of the fall of man, or, in other words, they maintain that he is able, by his own power, to regain a state of perfection. “ Educate the masses of the people, ‘ give them intelligence,’ let them understand their own interests, and they will soon give you a government which will demonstrate the perfectibility of man.” Now, let us suppose that our Socialist club are so well educated, that every man has a perfect knowledge of his own interest (this he never can have, but let us suppose it possible) ; there are 1000 persons who have really ten different interests and objects. The bricklayer, the carpenter, and the currier would each fortify the town in his own way, and according to his own trade, but, in order to make a trial of strength, the club will naturally divide into two parties ; here 400 take one side, and 600 the other ; 400 might be found to vote for Guizot, because they think he has good sense, while 600 would support Lamartine, because he tells them the Republic is one and indivisible. Must, then, the 400 submit to the 600 ? Rousseau would say not, for the will cannot be submitted to others. They must, therefore, form two clubs or two nations ; but, at the next meeting, the carpenters, after outvoting the curriers, may probably split from the bricklayers. Must there then be a new division, upon every new question ?

Against all these absurdities of the absolute rights of the will and the perfectibility of man, M. Guizot puts forward one or two simple arguments : that children are in subjection to their parents, and that even in savage life the children, as soon as they can use

their reason, have a voice in the movements of their father,—in other words, while the will is under control, expression of opinion is allowable, and must have weight; that idiots and lunatics must be restrained, because they are incapable of understanding what is right. Truth, therefore, and reason must be our guides, and not the mere unfettered will of any man or body of men, who have as little knowledge on many subjects as children. He then puts forward the true principles of social agreement, which alone can give permanence to any society.

“ 1. Permanent unity of social opinion represented by Government.

“ 2. Respect for public authorities.

“ 3. Subordination of individual inclinations to the law.

“ 4. Partition of rights according to capacity.

“ 5. Universal guarantee of liberty to every grade of persons; the supremacy of the Government being rigidly secured, for the affairs of the community are above all others, and can only be conducted by those who occupy a lofty position in the social scale. Such are the maxims of good sense, and the fundamental principles of social order.

“ Let a community be democratic or aristocratic, be its form of government monarchical or republican, it matters but little. These principles are not the less necessary, for they result, not from this or that condition of society, not from this or that form of government, but from the nature of man himself and all human relations; so that, wherever they degenerate, not only government, but society itself, becomes tottering and degraded.”—*Democracy*, p. 60.

After studying, as we have done, the writings of Lamartine, it is most agreeable to find good sense in a Frenchman of the nineteenth century. The man who exalts the Revolution of 1789 into “a gospel of social rights,” who imagines that by overthrowing existing institutions society is to be regenerated, and to burst forth into some imaginary effulgence which is to enlighten and renew the face of the world, such a one may think himself an eloquent writer, but we should be inclined to treat him as M. Guizot would a dangerous lunatic: we should wish to see his will put under some restraint. No man could better know or describe the horrors of the guillotine, yet this is the man who led France into the Revolution of 1848.

England was once tempted in the same way, but England was a Protestant country, scriptural light was widely diffused, and though truth was obscured by the dark clouds of Puritanism, still scriptural light was there, and prevailed in the end. M. Guizot, in his short pamphlet on the English revolution, has taken up the points of history with admirable skill. He has led us through the mazes of the great Rebellion, the Commonwealth, and the Restoration, as one who sees clearly cause and effect. He

has evidently before his mind the Revolution in France, with its frightful ebullitions of democratic tyranny, and the awful effects of the unrestrained passions of a multitude. England in 1649 passed through a revolution, but it was guided by mistaken views of true religion: there was still the fear of God and the recognition of his service, and Englishmen sought rather to defend their ancient rights, than to acquire some new and untried system of political perfection.

“The English Reformers, especially those who aimed only at political reform, did not think a revolution necessary. The whole past history of their country, its laws, traditions, and precedents, were dear and sacred in their eyes; they found in them the justification of their claims, as well as the sanction of their principles. It was in the name of the Great Charter, and of all those statutes by which, through the course of four centuries, it had been confirmed, that they demanded their liberties: for four centuries not a generation of men had dwelt upon the soil of England, without uttering the name and beholding the presence of Parliament. The great barons and the people, the country gentlemen and the burgesses, met together in 1640, not to dispute with each other claims to new acquisitions, but to regain in concert their common inheritance; they met to recover their ancient and positive rights, not to pursue the boundless combinations and hopes suggested by the imagination of man. . . . Providence also granted them an especial favour; they were not doomed at the outset to commit the dangerous wrong of attacking spontaneously, and without a clear and urgent necessity, a mild and inoffensive ruler. Charles I., full of haughty pretensions, though devoid of elevated ambition, and moved rather by the desire of not derogating in the eyes of the kings, his peers, than by that of ruling with a strong hand over his people, twice attempted to introduce into the country the maxims and practice of absolute monarchy. The first time, in presence of Parliament, at the instigation of a vain and frivolous favourite, whose presumptuous incapacity shocked the good sense and wounded the self-respect of the humblest citizen. The second time, by dispensing with Parliament altogether, and ruling alone by the hand of a minister, able and energetic, ambitious and imperious, though not without greatness of mind, devoted to his master, by whom he was imperfectly understood and ill-supported, and aware too late that kings are not to be saved solely by incurring ruin, however nobly, in their service.—*English Revolution*, pp. 4, 5.

Thus the Revolution began with religion and the assertion of political rights; but when it had arisen to its height, and the king had actually suffered death, a re-action was beginning: the good sense of the English nation showed them that they had gone too far. England, under the fear of worse consequences, for a while supported Oliver Cromwell as a dictator, and as forming the strongest government; but he felt his own want of

hereditary right, or, in other words, the common consent of public opinion to support his rule. On this subject M. Guizot says,

“When the House of Commons, now absolute sovereign of the country, nominated the republican Council of State, twenty-two, out of its forty-one members, positively refused to take the oath which contained an approval of the king’s sentence. The republican regicides, with Cromwell at their head, were compelled to accept as colleagues men whom nothing could induce to pass for their accomplices.

“The resistance which the new form of government encountered was at first merely passive, but it was almost universal.

“Six out of the twelve judges absolutely refused to continue the exercise of their functions, and the six others only consented to sit, on condition that they should continue to administer justice according to the ancient laws of the country. To these terms the republican Parliament acceded.

“Orders had been given that the Republic should be proclaimed in the City of London. The lord mayor refused; he was superseded, and thrown into prison. But though a new lord mayor was chosen, three months passed away before the proclamation was attempted; and when at length it was read, several aldermen absented themselves from the ceremony, which, in spite of the presence of troops, was interrupted by popular insult. The common council of the City was re-organized; several of the members elected refused to serve, and it was necessary that a smaller number than that appointed by law should be empowered to act. The Government was on the point of being driven to abolish the franchises of the City.

When the Mint was ordered to coin republican money, the master declared he would have nothing to do with it, and threw up his office. Civil functionaries and beneficed clergymen were required to take an oath of fidelity to the Republic; and though it was rendered as simple and as inoffensive as possible, thousands gave up their places or their livings rather than comply. More than a year after the establishment of the Republic, the Assembly of the Presbyterian Clergy, held in London, formally declared that it was not lawful to take it. In the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge it was made compulsory; upon which, the most eminent members of those learned corporations resigned their offices.

The order issued to efface and destroy the insignia of royalty on all the public edifices throughout England, was scarcely any where executed. It was reiterated several times, with no better success; and the Republic, which had been established for more than two years, was compelled to repeat the same injunction all over the country, and to render the parishes responsible for its execution.

“Lastly,—it was not till nearly two years after the king’s death that the republican Parliament dared to pass a formal vote, declaring that the authors, judges, and executors of that act had done their duty;

approving the whole proceeding, and ordering it to be entered on the journals of Parliament.

“Never did a people vanquished by a revolutionary faction, and enduring its defeat without open insurrection, more distinctly refuse to recognize the authority of its conquerors.

“The passive resistance of the country to the republican Government was soon succeeded by the attacks of declared enemies.”—*English Revolution*, p. 20.

Here we have, no doubt, a very true picture: England first resisting tyranny under royalty, and then refusing to acknowledge the usurper. There were, however, advocates of progress in those days as well as in the present. These were the destroyers of all government, who could not rest satisfied with the republic of Sidney and Milton, but declared themselves levellers and communists. Four insurrections of sectarian soldiers rapidly succeeded each other; and men who had something to lose began to fear for their property. The natural step from anarchy is to tyranny: and this Cromwell effectually established by dissolving the Long Parliament. M. Guizot thus continues:—

“The Republic had been established in the name of liberty; but under the rule of the Parliament, liberty had been a vain name, covering the tyranny of a faction. After the expulsion of the Parliament, the Republic became in its turn an empty word, preserved like one of those falsehoods which still serve a purpose, though they have ceased to deceive; and the despotism of one man constituted for five years the Government of England.”—*English Revolution*, p. 35.

For a while the talents of Cromwell kept the army together, but after his death the Commonwealth, or rather the dictatorship, fell to pieces by its own inherent weakness, and all parties, including Richard Cromwell, rejoiced in the restoration of Charles II.

The great value of M. Guizot's pamphlet is, that it gives an opportunity of comparing France and England. England broke out into rebellion, and passed from anarchy and tyranny to her former constitution. France passed through two revolutions, and still continues to make progress. We extract two passages from “The Times” to show the nature of a Parisian election in 1850, and what the English House of Commons is likely to be, if the advocates of progress could only obtain their ends.

“The first name on the list was that of our old friend citizen Cabet, of Icarian celebrity, whose experimental knowledge of Socialist principles is undoubted, since he dispatched a cargo of his fraternal associates to perish in the wilds of Texas, and found means to plunder a still larger class of dupes of all they possessed. No man certainly has done

more than M. Cabet to demonstrate that 'property is theft.' In spite, however, of this auspicious commencement, the chances of Cabet wore away with the night. A more formidable competitor followed in the second place, in the person of Jean Daniel, *alias* Henry, a private in the 23rd Regiment of the Line, whose qualifications were thus pithily described by his supporters:—'Daniel was born on the 24th of February, 1825, in the Finisterre.' [We suspect that the remarkable coincidence of the birth-day of this mute inglorious Hampden with the anniversary of the last 'glorious' revolution, was his most powerful claim to public sympathy.] 'He never knew his parents; as a shepherd, a shoemaker, and a soldier, he is a self-taught man; and for four years *has never once been punished!*' And thereby, oh! invincible force of democracy, this shepherd, shoemaker, and soldier, was very nearly chosen to be the representative of the mighty city of Paris!"

"The well-known Abbé Chatel turned the Scriptures into ridicule, and observed that 'the Christian religion had made a grievous mistake in setting bounds to the gratification of the passions.' He advocated, in gross terms, the full and unrestrained gratification of all human appetites, and maintained that in the most sensual materialism was placed the supreme felicity of man. He designated the Saviour of the world in terms not to be hinted at. In fact, of the Abbé Chatel's speech, which was enthusiastically applauded, the less that is said the better. His doctrines were, he maintained, indispensable to the perfection of the republican form of government. Another made an open profession of Atheism. 'I know no God,' he cried, 'except the sun, and him because he is visible.' The chairman qualified the declaration by adding, that no doubt he spoke of the sun as the '*commis* of another still more powerful.' He spoke of the men who have fled from the justice of their own country, and are now in a foreign land, and of the transported insurgents of June as 'martyrs.'

"Another speaker maintained that the soil belonged only to the people (the Socialists), and that the poor were the slaves and serfs of the rich.

"The claims of a person described as 'a distinguished artist,' were rejected at the same meeting, from no other reason than that it was believed he was a proprietor.

"Another candidate founded his claim to public favour on the fact of his having shed much blood, and having been for years a conspirator against every form of Government."

Now to us it is as plain as any mathematical demonstration, that tyranny must be the result of such proceedings, because insecurity is the predominant feature of all such governments. When a ruler begins to wear armour under his clothes, like Oliver Cromwell, or to fear the sentence of another faction, like Robespierre, he must become a tyrant in his own defence; he must sacrifice the lives of others for the protection of his own.

This is the real secret of the cruelty of the French Revolution; each party only held office by the will of the people, and their uncertain tenure obliged them to destroy their competitors, for they knew that if they did not, they themselves must be the victims. The title of Queen Victoria to the throne of England is universally acknowledged; not only her life, but her office is guaranteed to her by law under all circumstances; she can therefore afford to be merciful to a rival; in other words, if a traitor denies her right, she may pardon him without danger to herself. When Smith O'Brien and the other Irish rebels were convicted of high treason, his friends endeavoured to intimidate the Government and to urge them upon the score of weakness, and the pressure of public opinion. Now this was a course exactly opposite to the right one—revenge could be no gratification to those in office, and it is to be presumed that the cabinet would naturally lean to the side of mercy; but if the ministry had supposed that the throne of England was in danger, or if they had had private information that the rebellion were likely to break out again, or if they had thought that the institutions and property of the country were seriously threatened, their duty would have been to allow the law to take its course.

We read with horror of the cruelty of Tiberius and Caligula, but it must in a great degree be attributed to the position in which they were placed. They were not kings by inheritance or by the laws of their country, they were merely generals—"imperator" only signifies the commander of an army. They were surrounded with dangerous rivals, and obliged to put them out of their way. Like Waldemar Fitzurse, in "Ivanhoe," they felt to their opponents that "there is no prison like what the sexton makes," that a banished rival may return with increased popularity, and thus self-defence and necessity always became the tyrant's plea. The insecurity of the French democratic rulers, and the fears of the Roman Emperors, gave rise to two new crimes unknown to the law in countries where the government is secure: these were *incivism* and *majestas*. Thousands perished in the French Revolution for the supposed crime of disliking the new form of government, and hundreds suffered under the Roman Empire under the accusation of assaulting the majesty of the Republic. The real meaning of these words is opposition to those invested with temporary power: their fears magnify a rash word into treason, and their influence at the moment enables them to identify themselves with the State. The dictator says, "Here are persons whom I fear; if I do not kill them, they will kill me."

In the history of the Roman empire a change of administration

usually involved the execution of the late ministers; in revolutionary France it always did. Now there must be changes in public opinion and in administrations; but where there is a constitutional and hereditary king, acknowledged *jure divino*, there is always a rallying point for honest and loyal subjects. We may lawfully prefer Lord John Russell or Sir Robert Peel, and we may properly endeavour to substitute the one for the other, but the Crown itself is inviolable; and while the advisers of the Crown are responsible to the nation, the penalty is not the loss of life, but of office. If it were the fashion (as in Paris in 1796) to behead a prime minister as soon as he could no longer command a majority, he would be bound, in self-protection, to get rid of his opponents; but when the penalty imposed on ill-success only amounts to a change of his side in the House of Commons, he can afford to treat his political enemies with the lenity which he himself expects. Louis Napoleon is not so; he sees under his feet the volcano of a Socialist mob, ready to burst forth in a moment; from these he knows that he can expect no mercy. He may probably hold his place for some time, as there is still some sense left in France, and some property to be protected. The upper and middle classes cling to him as a refuge against the tyranny of the *forçats* and *sans culottes*; but this is all. He has no acknowledged right, the votes which placed him in office can displace him again; and unless he could follow his uncle's example, and declare himself emperor, he is not likely to find any real stability for his government. Napoleon, like Cromwell, was a military despot, but his talents and his army gave him vast power; he was a usurper, but his great support was, that one tyrant is preferable to many. Perhaps such a government is the best for France; for if something of the kind does not arise, and God does not interpose to save the nation from itself, we do not see how France can avoid the conclusion to which its progress is bringing it,—that property is robbery, and Christianity has had its day.

ART. IV.—*The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority, but Limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, &c. Oxford: J. H. Parker.*

THE subject of the Royal, or, rather, the *State* supremacy, is one which has assumed recently new bearings in reference to the Church. Time was, and that not long since, when the words "Church" and "King," in their combination, conveyed to the Churchman's mind something for which he could have been willing to lay down his life. It reminded him of a State, sanctified and blessed by faith—of sovereigns, who were "the nursing fathers" and "the nursing mothers" of the Church—of a Church knit by ties of gratitude to monarchs, who felt the care of the faith their first and highest duty; and in her fidelity sharing the persecution, the exile, and the restoration of that sacred monarchy. When we looked back on those times, our hearts might well burn within us, and we might endeavour to persuade ourselves that such things were not wholly lost, that our country still retained the same essential characteristics, though outward forms were changing around us. We could not, and we would not, for many years, open our eyes to the progress of events; and perhaps we should have gone on for ever defending the supremacy of the Crown against all classes of opponents—Dissenters, Romanists, and others—had not the State itself, by its own course of action, brought conviction to our minds, that the supremacy of 1850 is, indeed, a very different thing from that of 1550; that the dominion has, in truth, passed from the Edwards and the Elizabeths to the Parliaments of the nineteenth century, and to *their* ministers.

Our submission to the "powers that be," our loyalty to the Crown, our desire to maintain the existing order of things, our averseness to agitation and change, have not gained for the Church of England the consideration which is extended to every sect in the country, however petty and insignificant. Our wishes have been disregarded on all occasions. Our petitions have been again and again rejected, and with contempt. If we have sought for years for an increase in the Episcopate—if the justice of the claim has been conceded so far, and so strongly supported, that even the Government has come forward and proposed to accede to our wishes in some imperfect degree—we are doomed to see

the utter disappointment of our expectations. But we will not go through the painful survey of all the thousand acts of the State, each year becoming more and more pointed, intelligible, and manifest to the most ordinary comprehension, and demonstrating that the union between Church and State, founded on a community of principle and of interest, has become the *servitude* of the Church to an alienated power, which no longer shares her religion, or desires her spiritual welfare.

Let it not be alleged, in answer to this, that Parliament busies itself in enacting laws about our revenues and our duties, our cathedrals and our ecclesiastical commissions, our residence and our pluralities. Yes, Parliament is very busy at times in such matters; and we have Horsmans, and Halls, and Cobdens, and Bernal Osbornes, and Humes, who are very ready and willing to interfere in our affairs on all occasions. But we cannot recognize in these movements any thing that demands our gratitude. *Reform* is busy in every direction where Parliament can have any pretext for intermeddling. It is the *fashion* of the day: and far be it from us to deny that it is largely needed. But it is the fashion of the day; and every politician who seeks pre-eminence must be known as a reformer. And the Church is, according to the doctrine most fashionable in Parliament, a department of the public service, an establishment of the State, an establishment which owes its faith and its discipline, its temporalities and its spiritualities, to the State. And therefore they hold that all its affairs and concerns are matters of State cognizance, and are within the limits to which reform, conducted in the usual way, by Acts of Parliament and commissions, and the other apparatus of State machinery, is applicable. And each interference of the kind is a source of satisfaction to the enemies of the Church in Parliament and in the State generally, because it is an additional assertion of the principle of absolute *power* over the temporalities and spiritualities of the Church, which is the first step to the overthrow of both.

It may be very well for persons to talk of the desirableness of augmenting the income of the poorer livings at the expense of the bishoprics, or of the wealthier livings, and so forth: but it is very possible to talk thus, and yet to desire the overthrow of the Church altogether. It is still easier to talk thus, by way of being in the fashion, and gaining the credit of a reformer of State institutions, and yet to resist all real reform of the Church; all such reform as would not merely put a clergyman in each parish, but would animate that clergyman to the discharge of his duty, and aid him in the care of his people, by restoring the apostolical spirit, and taking the Church as far away as possible from the

carnal spirit, and the earthly objects of all mere State establishments.

These pretended *Church* reformers, when do they ever look beyond the division and sharing of temporalities, and the material facts of income, pluralities, and parsonage-houses; to the *faith* of the Church; its discipline; the discipline not merely of the clergy, but of all its members; the *morality* which it is to inculcate, not only by precept and example, but by discouragement and censure of evil? When do they dream of allowing the Church to deliberate and to act for the removal of the vast moral evils around us? When do they think of ensuring the appointment of holy and God-fearing men to our bishoprics and other high offices? When do they seek to promote the more diligent supervision of the Church by an increased number of overseers? No; they can consent to meddle with our temporalities: the worst enemies of the Church are willing to do so, and even by so doing to add to the apparent strength of the Church in some districts. But they will neither themselves seek really to improve the Church in more essential points, nor will they let the Church herself act, if they can help it.

We speak thus merely by way of reply to those who might remind us of such Acts as the Cathedral Bill, or Sir Robert Peel's Bill, as indicating an anxiety on the part of the State for the welfare of the Church. We do not deny that some part of the State feels favourably to the Church, but we have yet to hear of any acts that show such a feeling on the part of the State itself, as a whole. We point to a few simple and conclusive facts, which refute any such notion. Ten bishoprics have been suppressed; two-thirds of the income of the clergy in Ireland has been taken from them; one-half the income of the English clergy is in the process of annihilation; our universities are invaded; our parochial education is placed under the absolute and arbitrary control of the State; and our faith is interfered with by the State tribunals.

The Church has been, comparatively speaking, passive amidst the events of the last twenty-two years; but her peaceful attitude, the absence of agitation which has long marked her course, have not induced her opponents to imitate her example. Every thing like "agitation" on behalf of the Church has uniformly been frowned on by the State, and by those ecclesiastical functionaries who are under State influence, or who represent State authority. We have been taught to depend on the heads of the Church, and on the ministers, or on some political party, for every thing. And what has been the result? If the Church is quiet, her enemies are not so; they are always seeking their

objects, they are always resisting Church objects, and they are generally successful. The State listens to *them* with respect and deference: to the Church, its tone is contemptuous, and its proceedings arbitrary and tyrannical. The moderation and loyalty of the Church cannot obtain for it the terms which are conceded to the obstinate demands of sectarians, who have had no scruple in disobeying the laws.

We have thus far been contending that the union of Church and State has become an essentially different relation from what it formerly was, since the State has relinquished its creed. We have been arguing that a creedless State is a very different thing from a "Church of England" State. But what is our inference from this? Do we hence infer that no kind of concord, alliance, or harmony may subsist between the Church of England and the creedless State of England? We should be far from laying down such a principle as this. There seems no reason why the State of England should not be in alliance with the Church, though it does not hold the faith of the Church. The relations of the Prussian and Russian Governments to the Roman Churches in their states; the relations of the Greek Government (which is Romish) to the Greek Church; the relations of the French and Belgian states, which are creedless, like ours, to the Gallican and Belgic Churches; all are instances of States being connected with Churches where there is no religious union, no union in faith. So that there is no *impossibility* in such an alliance taking place, under certain conditions, satisfactory to both parties concerned. The Church of Rome willingly enters into such relations with sovereigns not of its communion; and we need not be more scrupulous, provided the advantages and securities in our case are equal.

There is, however, a very great difference between our case and that of the continental Churches referred to. In those cases the sovereign of the State holds relation to the Church of his State in virtue of a *concordat* or treaty with the Papal See, as an independent power, and as the *recognized head of the Church*. The appointment of bishops, the endowment of sees, parishes, seminaries, &c., are matters agreed upon by the Pope and the sovereign. So that in all cases there is an actual treaty and alliance of the State with the Church as an independent power. Certain benefits are conferred by the State, and, in return for these, certain privileges are given by the Church; and both may be resumed.

And, again, the State in all those cases where concordats have been entered into, is a Monarchy or a State possessed of a vigorous central power, which refrains itself, and causes others to refrain,

from meddling with the internal concerns of the Church. The internal concerns of the Church in such cases as we refer to, are regulated by the bishops, or the Pope. If synods are not often held, the current of legislation and spiritual regulation is always going on by ordinances of the congregations at Rome, and new papal bulls and decrees. The State does not take the internal affairs of the Church under its cognizance, or interfere with them at all. If it goes beyond its limits, and usurps what belongs to the Church only, it is met not merely by the protests of the Church thus injured, but by the protests and censure of the Papacy, and of all the rest of the Roman communion; and the maintainer of Church liberties is sure of sympathy and support in every other country, if not in his own.

Many of the continental sovereigns possess, by modern or ancient concordats, the right of nominating bishops in their dominions; but the Pope has the right of rejecting Crown nominees, and refusing to permit their consecration. So completely established is the power of the Papacy in respect to the confirmation and appointment of bishops, that, in case of non-recognition of a government by the Pope, or of any dispute, bishoprics sometimes remain vacant for years, and even the whole episcopate of a country sometimes seems almost on the verge of extinction.

Now this shows how fully an alliance or union between Church and State, which is quite sufficient for all State and Church purposes respectively, is consistent with the acknowledgment of independence in the Church on certain points. Even in Spain, Portugal, Austria, and other Roman Catholic governments, the appointment of bishops is subject to the papal consent, so that in all cases the Church has some real control over the State, some power of self-protection.

As to the Russian Church, it is much in the position in which the Church of England was from the time of the Reformation to that of William III. The State is *absolute* in Church matters, but the State is rigidly and earnestly *orthodox*; its great object is to promote the Church's extension, to bring all its subjects within the pale of the Church. Therefore, on the whole, it does all that is possible to promote the efficiency of the Church, just as our Elizabeth, James, and Charles did.

The Russian State assumes the great powers in Church matters which the Greek emperors in the later ages acquired. We do not think that the assumption of such power by any State, or its concession by any Church, is to be desired: it may, under some circumstances, however, be very *tolerable*; and those circumstances applied, we think, in the case of the Church of England after the Reformation, as they now do in Russia.

In considering the present state of the connexion between Church and State in England, it is, of course, necessary to bear in mind, that, whatever those relations might have been as recognized and approved on principle by the Church in her Articles and Canons, the whole state of the case is altered, by the State ceasing to possess a Creed, or coming to include persons of all religions. The idea of the State conceived by the Church in the sixteenth century, as a religious and godly State, is practically extinct; the head of the State alone retaining the Christian character, but without any political power annexed to it.

But there is another point, also, well deserving of examination by *Churchmen*. What does the *Church of England* really ascribe, in point of principle, to the State? Does it recognize in a Christian State, as of right, any absolute power in Church matters? Or is its view such as is calculated, if acted on, to maintain a fair and reasonable degree of liberty for the Church, while it holds that Christian States have duties and powers in reference to religion?

We hold that the Church of England is not in any degree tied to acknowledge such a supremacy as now exists by *law*, as one that has any claim to her support, either on the grounds of Scripture or of ancient practice. The Church of England recognizes a very different species of supremacy: it believes in the supremacy of a *Christian Sovereign*. Let us briefly survey its declarations:—

“Art. XXXVII. *Of the Civil Magistrates*.—The Queen’s Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.”

This portion of the Article makes an assertion relative to the Crown, which was strictly borne out by *fact* when the Articles were composed. The Crown then *had* the chief government *in reality*, as it now has nominally. The chief government has now fallen into other hands, and the Crown is divested of power. The Church of England, therefore, did not contemplate the *present* state of the Crown, when she expressed thus firmly and decidedly her views of the Crown’s power in relation to ecclesiastical affairs. Her declaration referred to a state of things widely different from the present; nor is her Article, which recognizes the chief government of the Crown, to be strained into a recognition of the chief government of the *House of Commons*, and the *ministers* really appointed by it. No power is referred to but the Crown, as possessed of its old constitutional powers, now lost.

“Where we attribute to the Queen’s Majesty the chief government,

by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our princes the ministering, either of God's word or of the sacraments, the which thing the injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our queen do most plainly testify, but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers."

It will be here observed, that the Church is speaking of a sovereign who is not only a real sovereign, possessed of power, but who represents the "*godly* princes" mentioned in Holy Scripture. In short, the Church here sets out on the notion of a "Church of England" prince, whose powers are not exercised by a House of Commons, but by himself. She refers to such princes as David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, who were all worshippers of the true God, and exercised the royal power for the maintenance of the true faith against idolatry, and "restrained with the civil sword" the worshippers of false gods, the heretics and schismatics of their days. The Church here distinctly supposes a sovereign who does not tolerate or patronize false religion, but who acts on the powers at that time *claimed* by the Crown (and regularly exercised), of *punishing* by the civil sword all who dissented from the faith and worship of the Church of England; or restraining them by civil penalties. The Church of England could not have any other notion of a sovereign power but this; for the whole law of the land, up to the time of William III., went on the assumption that it was the duty of the sovereign to use the civil sword for the suppression of all religions contrary to that of the Church of England. Nor was there any State in Europe that had ever acted on the principle of toleration.

Hence we may reasonably infer that in this article, the Church of England, in ascribing the supreme government of the Church to the sovereign, supposed a sovereign who was possessed of sovereign *power*, who was also "godly" in her sense, and whose "godliness" included as an essential element the non-toleration of all doctrines different from those of the Church of England. The Constitution has put an end to such a sovereignty as the Church of England contemplated in her Articles and Prayer Book, so that our subscription in the present day supposes a state of things in the State that has been long obsolete; and in declaring by subscription to the Articles that the Queen is supreme governor, and that she possesses the power of restraining evil-doers given to godly kings in the Bible, and of ruling all states and degrees, we must understand ourselves as rather declaring

that the Queen *was* supreme, and *did* possess such powers in the sixteenth century, than that she does so in fact in the nineteenth. We can only say now, that the sovereign *possesses* those powers IN THEORY, not in fact; and that the Church, which supposes them to be possessed in fact, does not mean to pronounce any thing about a state of things in which they are merely possessed in theory. We maintain that the language of the XXXVIIth Article, though it may, in its mere technical and *legal* construction, apply to the present state of things, does not *really* apply to it at all; and that it would be a slavish adherence to the letter, divorced from the spirit, to uphold this or any similar declarations of the Church of England in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries as applicable to a totally different state of things in the nineteenth.

The first Article in the thirty-sixth Canon again refers to a state of things which has been put an end to by the law.

“That the King’s Majesty, under God, is the *only* supreme governor of this realm, and of all other His Highness’s dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within His Majesty’s said realms, dominions, or countries.”

This Article contemplates a state of things very different indeed from what now exists. It asserts the sole supremacy of the sovereign in *all* spiritual or ecclesiastical *things* or causes. But the law has put an end to this sole supremacy; for the supremacy of the Wesleyan Conference is now recognized as the sole authority over Methodists; the supremacy of the Pope is allowed in the case of the Romanists; and every other sect has its own supreme authority. The Crown has *ceased* to be supreme over Dissenters and sectarians generally, and is therefore no longer the “*only supreme governor*” in “*all spiritual or ecclesiastical things.*” The whole legislation of England, from the Toleration Act to the present day, has established this. Thus this Article refers to a different constitution from that which we now live under, and binds us to nothing but the supremacy as supposed to be existing with the constitution of A. D. 1562; for the Church does not suppose others to be exempt from the royal supremacy, and *herself alone* subject to it. She does not say that the Crown is supreme over the “Church of England,” but supreme over “this realm.”

It is of the highest importance for us to understand distinctly, and to be prepared to show, that we are not tied to the supre-

macy of the Crown, as at present existing, by any declarations of the Church of England. When this is fully understood (and every means should be taken for making the world understand it) one great obstacle to the liberation of the Church will have been removed. The existing supremacy will no longer be able to appeal in argument to the authority of the Church of England in its support; and those who may seek to obtain the modification or even removal of the supremacy in the case of the Church of England, as it has already been removed in the case of all other denominations of Christians, will not appear inconsistent with the doctrines of their own Church. It is in truth a remarkable instance of retribution, that the State, in throwing off its creed, has been by that very fact, deprived of all the benefit which its pretensions over the Church gained from the Church's own declarations and authority.

As far as matters of mere *principle* are concerned, we think the Church is now *wholly free*; she is not fettered by any of her declarations on the subject of the Royal Supremacy. The State has, by its own proceedings, rendered those declarations and definitions no longer applicable to the existing state of things. We are here regarding the question in a moral and religious point of view, not in a mere legal and technical way. We have little doubt that in the Courts of Law the supremacy is still held to be in full force: but for this we care little; for the only really important point is the question of principle—what is the real view of the Church of England to which we subscribe; and are we, as members of that Church, bound to recognize the supremacy of 1850 as lawful?

We think that whenever the doctrine of the supremacy of the Crown is recognized by Churchmen, the acknowledgment should be restricted and guarded, so as not to let it be supposed that we admit the *present* supremacy to be authorized or recognized by the Articles and formularies of the Church. But there is another question which we have not yet considered, and which is of very great moment. It is the question, What power does or *did* the Church of England ascribe to a "Church of England" or "orthodox" sovereign? The answer to this is comprised in the answer to the question, "What powers were exercised by the Christian emperors in the *Primitive Church*?" For the Church of England acknowledges this in her Canons, as she does the example of the pious and godly kings of the Jews in her Articles, as the only rule by which her opinions on this subject are guided and limited. The Church of England never acknowledged, even in the "orthodox" and "Christian" state, *more* than the primitive Church and the Scripture allowed to godly princes. As to the sentiments of

lawyers and of Acts of Parliament, we absolutely disclaim all authority in them ; they have *nothing* to do with our belief as Churchmen, we are not in the slightest degree bound by them, we are only bound to obey laws ; we are not bound, as Churchmen, to admit principles, or statements, or arguments, or assertions of legislators or of jurists.

We are indebted to Dr. Pusey for a learned and seasonable publication on this subject, the title of which we have placed at the commencement of these pages, and which brings a great body of facts to bear upon the solution of a question in which the character of the Church of England is greatly involved. There is, perhaps, nothing which has been found to work more injuriously against us than the doctrine on the Royal Supremacy, supposed to be upheld by the Church. Men have been too ready to make the Church responsible for all that has been said and done in former times, and in the present, by the State ; and the effect has been, that many impatient spirits have fallen into the hands of Dissent and Romanism, whose most popular argument against the Church has always been founded on her admission of the Royal Supremacy.

From what has been said above, it will be seen that we are of opinion, that the time for advocating, *as churchmen*, the Royal Supremacy, has passed by. We have nothing to do with the actual Royal Supremacy ; we only possess the *theoretical* or ideal supremacy, which was once a reality. We give up the actual supremacy as a matter that the Church has never approved of, and can never approve of. The formularies of the Church know nothing of the existing supremacy. So that the discussion in Dr. Pusey's volume might seem to have less immediate bearing on the questions at present most urgent than might be supposed. But this is not the case, for it is of the highest importance at the present time, to have clear views as to what the Church of England really did admit, when she recognized the supremacy of a godly prince ; and such a discussion, too, supplies various instructive facts, which will be of great value even now, when the State is no longer one in faith with the Church.

The earlier part of Dr. Pusey's volume is directed to meet the difficulty which was felt by such persons as Messrs. Maskell and Dodsworth, in reference to the Gorham case—their opinions being, that the decision of the Committee of Council was virtually that of the Church of England, and that the Church's doctrine was at once altered thereby. In the general purport of Dr. Pusey's remarks on this subject, we feel that there must be a cordial concurrence on the part of all true churchmen. We were inclined to doubt whether he had sufficiently clearly stated the

practical evils to doctrine, likely to arise from a legal sanction being given to persons of erroneous views to hold ecclesiastical benefices ; but in the latter part of his volume, those dangers are distinctly pointed out, while, at the same time, great indulgence is shown towards many persons who may be supposed to be imperfectly instructed. The great evils which may possibly arise from discussions on the inspiration of Scripture, or other fundamental doctrines, and the dangers of wrong decisions by a Court constituted like that of the Committee of Privy Council, and the necessity of an alteration in the tribunal for the decision of causes of doctrine, are clearly stated. And the conclusion is then drawn, that “the fundamental defect is, that the doctrines of the Church should, for any purpose, be authoritatively determined by any other than the Church herself.” This opens the question to which the volume is an answer.

“Is then this state of things one to which the Church intended to commit herself? or one to which we, by our acknowledgment of the royal supremacy, are bound?”

“For myself, I am satisfied that the Church never intended to concede any thing of this sort, nor do I believe that Queen Elizabeth, from whom the present Act of Supremacy dates, meant to claim it. I say, Queen Elizabeth, because what such an one as King Henry VIII., who knew no law of God or man, but his own passions, secretly meant, does not concern us. He meant, doubtless, to remove any restraint from his own will, and circumvented the Clergy to accomplish it. We have to consider principles, to which the Church has expressed her assent, not the acts of a lawless king.”—pp. 14, 15.

The object of the work, then, is to show what the Christian emperors in the primitive Church did, and did not claim ; theirs being the authority recognized by the Church of England, as annexed to the Crown. Dr. Pusey proves that they did not claim authority in controversies of faith, but limited themselves to convening the Bishops in synod, or appointing episcopal judges ; that ordinary synods were usually independent of the civil power, but that the emperors could urge obedience to the canons. There are many such points mentioned for which we must refer the reader to the volume, contenting ourselves with the following passage as bearing on one of the two great practical questions now before the Church, and which include every other question—we allude to *free synods*, and *free elections* of bishops. With reference to synods of the British Churches, Dr. Pusey speaks as follows :—

“Without going into questions as to the genuineness of this or that very early British synod, it will strike every one, looking into our early

history, how all great public acts were done in synods. We have two synods of St. Patrick; Dubritius, A.D. 512, was made archbishop, his successor, bishop of Llandaff, in a synod, according to the ancient rule. St. David and others, A.D. 516; the Pelagians are refuted in a synod, A.D. 519; the British bishops meet St. Augustine in synods; repeated synods are held about the way of keeping Easter, about the variance between Archbishop Theodore and St. Wilfred, and, in later times, about the replacing of secular canons by regular. A synod of Mercia, A.D. 705, gives in charge to Bishop Aldhelm, when a presbyter, to write against the British way of keeping Easter; in A.D. 707 a new bishopric was formed by a decree of a synod, royal donations to a monastery or a cathedral church were given in a synod, a dispute about land between a bishop of Worcester and the monks of Berkeley is settled in a synod, A.D. 824 . . ."

It was afterwards the regular law of the Church that synods should be held every year (pp. 101, 102, 103. 105, 106). The series of authorities extend from A.D. 673 to A.D. 978. In the tenth century, however, the bishops began to sit in the secular courts, and some confusion of jurisdiction arose in consequence, which was put an end to by William the Conqueror.

Annual synods continued after the Conquest (p. 109), and the suspension of them for thirteen years is spoken of as a great evil. They were more rarely held by degrees. Archbishop Stratford held a provincial synod, A.D. 1341, after a lapse of eight years (p. 110).

"It seems probable that, in later times, the regular meeting of convocation superseded the provincial councils, as consisting of the same persons, though not acting altogether in the same way. The penalties annexed for quitting convocation without leave, are the same as those appointed by the canons for so quitting the annual synods. It sat always when Parliament sat; often when Parliament did not. Kings had occasion for it, because it granted them revenues; and these being often triennial grants, their meeting, at least, every third year, was the rather secured. The writs for summoning them ran, 'Convene them as usual.' The same language was used by Cranmer, Philpot, and Pole. But even as late as the first year of Henry VIII., Archbishop Warham summoned convocation to consider the state of the Church, independently of the Crown, by his own authority as Primate."—pp. 111, 112.

The mind of the Church is now thoroughly awakened to the necessity of putting an end to the thralldom, in which the Crown has now for 130 years held her, by the unconstitutional and illegal suppression of her synods, and which has deprived the Crown of all moral claim to possess the power of controlling her synods any further. The demand for the royal license for convo-

cation to resume its sittings, is, however, the first step in the movement for the recovery of the Church's rights. But we have no expectation that this petition will be acceded to. The Government, and the heads of the Church under its influence, will not accede to a proposal which would give the Church a voice in its own behalf. The Government will not give way to any such desire for freedom. They are jealous of the Church, and they seek to place it even more under the control of the State than it is.

Now, then, it may be asked, What course should be pursued, if the Crown and the archbishops refuse to permit the assembling of convocation? We will enter into this question when we have made some further remarks on the position in which we actually find ourselves placed.

The dangers of the nineteenth century are widely different from those of the seventeenth, the sixteenth, the fifth, fourth, or third. We are in no danger of being compelled to worship false gods. Heresy is not the evil of this age. Schism has lost its vigour. Romanism deals only in arguments, addressed to the reason or the senses, and evinces no wish to restore the stake and the inquisition. All these sources of danger to the Church in former times, are not the dangers of the present age. We do not mean to dispute the activity of some of these agencies, or the positive harm they are doing; but we say that, looking at the subject as a whole, we do not think that our great danger is from Dissent, or Methodism, or Socinianism, or Romanism. They will never gain ground on the Church, which is fully a match for them all. She will hold on her own way, acting on her own belief, and leaving them to follow theirs.

But the real danger in the present day is INFIDELITY. We are not now speaking of any open denial of Christianity, because that is not the form which the infidelity of the present day assumes. The days of Voltaire, and Diderot, and D'Alembert, and Tom Paine have passed by; and no one now declares himself an unbeliever—in *England*, at least. There are now no avowed *enemies* of Jesus Christ: on the contrary, the infidelity of the nineteenth century is willing, if it recognizes his existence at all, to admit Him to the same degree of respect which it pays to Pythagoras or Confucius, to Socrates or to Schleiermacher. Christianity is recognized as a beneficial system—a system from which the world has largely profited—an important stage in the development of the human mind. The purity of its moral system is acknowledged, and its doctrinal system is held to comprise a larger infusion of truth than some other religions. The various stages in the progress of Christianity itself, are regarded with

philosophical approbation. The papacy is held to have been a great blessing to the Church during the Middle Ages. The Reformation is upheld as another great step in advance. It is viewed as the era of the development of those principles of free speculation unshackled by authority, which are to lead ultimately to the regeneration of the world.

Thus, then, all is apparently respectful and friendly in the view which the infidelity of the present day takes of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular. Christianity is rather patronized than otherwise. But, notwithstanding this, there is an absolute want of faith—as *total* an absence of faith as if Christ were openly denied. For Christianity is considered as one out of many religions, exhibiting equal claims and credentials, and as holding no more right to the character of a Divine Revelation than they do. All religions, including Christianity, are believed to contain some truth and some falsehood; and the belief of Christians in the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Divine Commission of the Apostles, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, or *the necessity of belief in any of the Articles of Christian faith*, is regarded as an antiquated absurdity, which is only deserving of pity and contempt.

But there are many degrees of progress in the development of opinions of this kind. It is not everyone who has proceeded so far as to set all religions on an equality, and mentally to see no difference in truth between Christianity and Buddhism. Many men profess, and perhaps feel, a preference for Christianity, but they employ the powers of their mind to criticise its tenets, with a view to eliminate from them whatsoever does not meet the requirements of their reason. Hence we find all the external evidences of Christianity rejected—every thing denied which can give it *authority* over reason. The inspiration of Scripture is systematically assailed: its interpretation is thrown open to the wildest license—its text is tampered with, and invested with doubt—its genuineness is involved in suspicion. All the authority of the belief of former ages, however universal or however ancient, is rejected with contempt. The practical conclusion aimed at is, that all sects of Christians are equally in the wrong; that disputes about any of the doctrines or duties of Christianity are an absurdity, because there can be no such thing as certainty on any point; that all disputes amongst Christians turn on points which are only matters of opinion, and on which every man has a right to his own opinion. Some, perhaps, are willing to acknowledge some doctrine or tenet to be true, but they argue that it is most absurd to affirm that the contrary opinion is false, or that it may not be held with perfect propriety. They look therefore on all creeds, formularies,

and articles of faith, and on all judgments of the Church, in matters of controversy, as objectionable, inasmuch as they tend to impair that perfect liberty of opinion which they claim for all persons, on the assumption that *all* doctrines and tenets are matters of opinion, and therefore mere human speculations. They endeavour to excite prejudice against creeds and formularies in general, sapping and undermining their authority by all means in their power. They are favourable to all measures which tend to lower and break down the authority of the Church as a body holding certain specific doctrines and tenets, and requiring them to be held. They will support those from whom they differ most widely, in the assertion of their opinions, with a view to establish the utmost freedom for the expression of opinions of all kinds.

The legislation of the age is wholly imbued with this spirit; the literature of the day is increasingly so; the State in England has for many years thoroughly *represented* it, and is engaged in steadily carrying it out *in all directions*. It has even infected the Church itself in some degree: there are various advocates of such views, in a greater or less degree, amongst the Clergy—some amongst the Bishops, several amongst the other Dignitaries. The influence of the State on the Church, in the way of patronage, is sufficient to account for this in some considerable degree; and that patronage is likely to be increasingly exercised in the same direction. The “Evangelical” party in the Church, though firm in its own belief of the inspiration of Scripture and in the Divine origin of Christian doctrines, has been for years deceived as to the real character of the movement to be most apprehended; has entered into terms of alliance with its most bitter enemies, and has placed itself unreservedly in the hands of the State, to carry out its policy in religious matters. It has been led into this false position by its dread of principles of a more orthodox character than its own, and which it identifies with Romanism; but, deceived as it has been, it is apparently involved inextricably in the toils which have been laid for it, and, it is to be feared, that it will act henceforward as the ally and the tool of those who are thoroughly imbued with the infidelity of *this* age.

Such is the aspect of things around us. In every direction—within and without—are signs of the same plague of unbelief which has desolated Christianity in many parts of the Continent. Each day makes the nature of the case more and more plain, and writes before the Church, in more unmistakeable characters, the real perils we have to confront. Their progress is slow and stealthy, but ever advancing. Sometimes beaten back for a time, then spreading in another direction. Checked more or less by

public opinion, then becoming bolder : always, however, spreading and gaining force. They are unpopular with the people, rejected by the mass of the bishops and of the clergy, and yet possessed of formidable vantage-ground in their entire possession of the State, and the support which they receive from all enemies of the Church—all sectarians—most liberals in politics—and the tacit co-operation of one believing party in the Church.

And at what immense disadvantage is the opposite principle of *firm hereditary faith* to be maintained ! It is to be maintained in opposition, too frequently, to authority. Those who see distinctly the real character of the questions before the Church, and who act accordingly, are liable to discouragements, opposition, condemnation, in even those quarters where their fidelity should obtain for them the most affectionate support and the most earnest co-operation. They are liable to be denounced sometimes as disturbers of the peace of the Church ; at other times, as disloyal to their sovereign ; and always as uncharitable to their neighbours. They are regarded as turbulent and factious men ; and the duty of sitting still and occupying themselves with the ordinary duties of their calling, and leaving higher matters to God and to those in authority, is pressed on them by earnest but mistaken men—by men who do not discern “the signs of the times.”

The object of the heads of the Church is, for the most part, to maintain “peace” in the Church. Far be it from us to question the duty of endeavouring to preserve and restore peace. But there are times in which peace itself becomes a secondary object—nay, more, when it becomes treason.—And when all faith is endangered, it is the office of the Church to look, in the first place, to the preservation of *faith*—to take such steps as shall be necessary for placing the deposit of faith in security, and to do so without fear of consequences. There have been times when Christians were called, by the voice of conscience and by the sense of responsibility to their Maker and their Saviour, to disturb the world and the Church ; when they had to resist prevalent beliefs, and to disobey prevalent laws. And where should we now be, had the early Christians, and the orthodox in the time of Arius, and the English Reformers, listened to those who would have spoken to them of “peace, when there was no peace ?” When the *real* question at stake is, whether infidelity or faith is to have the ascendancy in the Church of England, we can know nothing of “peace.” Far be it from us to doubt that the truth of this is felt where we should wish it to be felt. We have had some encouraging signs to persuade us that it is so ; and we feel hopeful that events will disclose more distinctly the course of duty, which at present appears to be entangled by complex considera-

tions, leading (with some noble exceptions) to an apparently *unstable* and uncertain course of action.

But we have this alarming fact, that the State, which is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of which we have been speaking, exercises, in various ways, immense and most dangerous power over our episcopate. The power of selection, *without the slightest power of check or control* on the part of the Church, is, in the present state of things, the most formidable danger we know of. It is in this way that the most deadly blows may be struck at faith. The State must be *expected* to place its own agents and instruments in authority—men who will be prepared to carry out its views, whatever they may be—men chosen for their principles. This danger becomes imminent in proportion as the Church manifests its resolution to act on principles opposed to those of the State. The immediate remedy of the State is, to exercise its *patronage*, in order to break down opposition: it is already acting thus in Ireland and in England. But, besides this, the fact that all bishops owe their appointment to the Crown exclusively, *must* exercise a powerful influence on their conduct, in binding them to the leaders of one or other of the political parties; all of whom are connected, more or less, with the natural policy of a creedless State in religious questions. Seats in Parliament, connexion with ministers and ex-ministers, attendance on the Court, association with the political and great world,—all tend to form a pliant, an easily-managed episcopate—an episcopate that will discourage all movements of which the State does not approve.

Of the dignitaries of the Church, the deans are the nominees of Government, and therefore naturally reflect its views, and are its advocates, for the most part: independently of which, the Government has the power of advancing them. The archdeacons are the nominees of the bishops, and are therefore less directly under the influence of the State; yet they show, in too many instances, that the State has too great an influence with them. The State nominates to 1200 parochial benefices out of 12,000, besides more than half the canonries. By its occasional distribution of bishoprics and deaneries it maintains its influence over the universities, the rulers of which are unwilling to do any thing to impair their prospects. Generally speaking, there is a great temptation to all men in leading positions in the Church to pursue such a line of conduct as shall not exclude them from the favour of Government; so that, at any crisis, they may very frequently be observed to be extremely timid, cautious, and rather an impediment than otherwise.

Besides all this, the deliberative action of the Church in synod is wholly suppressed. In some instances, rural deans are permitted to hold meetings of the clergy; but the practice is very limited, and an isolated rural deanery, without the power of communicating with other similar bodies, can do little more than an isolated clergyman: for, fifteen or twenty clergy, even if met together, can do nothing. Archdeaconry synods there are none; it is wholly optional with an archdeacon to call a meeting of the clergy to petition, and in many cases it is refused. Diocesan synods there are none; the bishops apparently considering their assembly illegal or unadvisable, as they are never held. Convocation can only be held by consent of the State, and the State has exercised its power, and silenced it for a hundred and thirty years. Thus, amidst the dangers surrounding the faith of the Church, there is actually no regular mode recognized by the law for the members of the Church even to take counsel together, and to devise means for preserving the faith which they have received from their forefathers, and which they see to be endangered. This recapitulation of the perils to which faith is exposed, will show that the contest for the maintenance of that faith without any infusion of the principles of the present day, is indeed an arduous task. The question is, however, whether, by a series of concessions on one side, and of quiet and stealthy aggression on the other, those principles shall gain influence and ultimate ascendancy in the Church; or whether, by a course of proceeding adequate to the evil, the further influx of evil shall be checked, and the faith of the Church stand in security against alien influences.

Let us now briefly survey the circumstances which afford to us a reasonable ground for hope amidst the struggle which is unquestionably before us.

In the first place we must speak of the *spirit* of the Church itself—we mean the great body of the inferior clergy and the intelligent laity, who are wholly independent of Government. We believe that the Church in general is better prepared for the crisis than she has ever yet been. Her faith has been sorely tried for many years by doctrines and errors of various kinds, and in various directions, and the result has been, we think, to form a great mass of men in firm and robust principles, not likely to be easily shaken—men who have not the remotest inkling of an idea of leaving the Church of England for Rome, or for any other communion whatever—men who thoroughly understand their position, and will maintain it at all hazard—men who are determined that, as far as in them lies, not one point shall be conceded to the infidel spirit of the day, and not an effort shall

be spared to obtain reasonable and satisfactory securities for the faith.

They have learned, at length, how to collect their forces, though by an imperfect organization, with leaders chosen, not for their official rank, but for their fidelity; and they have begun to make head against the foe, and already they have struck some lusty blows for the good cause, and stand prepared for more, and with increasing forces. Now we do say this, that the recognition of the principle of the *right of voluntary association*, a principle so reluctantly adopted, and still, in many quarters, regarded with so much jealousy, is the greatest step that the Church of England has ever yet taken towards self-protection. It gives to her members that which they have never had before—the power of conference and deliberation, and of combined and *continuous* action. This is an immense step gained. We are no longer a rope of sand, or a multitude of units without cohesion, or a body raised into momentary life and action by some attack, and then sinking back again into torpor and despondency; we are no longer without the power of conference and of action;—the necessities of the times have at length given us freedom so far, without seeking for the State's consent.

It is a well-known principle of the Universal Church, that in times of heresy, when the faith is endangered, all ordinary rules are suspended by necessity. In such times, steps become permissible without seeking the consent of superiors, which would not, in different times, be fitting. Another ground of hope arises from our episcopate. The conduct of a considerable number of bishops in the Hampden case, and the step which the whole episcopate has recently taken in agreeing to the measure which the Bishop of London has embodied in his Bill respecting appeals, must, we think, be felt by every one as steps in a course of policy which is very remote indeed from a spirit of subserviency to the State, and in both instances these steps were taken *in accordance* with the feeling of the Church. The State has not given way to the wishes of the bishops, they have thrown out the Bill; and it will be felt, that those prelates who are in favour of it will not be in favour with the Government. If so, the Government will have less influence in future over those prelates, and the cause of the Church will gain. On the other hand, had the Government offered no opposition to such a Bill, the bishops would have been encouraged, perhaps, to try to pass some *other* measure sought by the Church; therefore there is good in either case. And we have a further ground of hope in the unsatisfactory and bad appointments to bishoprics and deaneries which are taking place, and which will point out to orthodox bishops

still more distinctly their duties towards the faith. We may also trust, that in proportion as the Church at large manifests its wishes in such a mode as to command attention from the State, and puts forward objects unexceptionable in themselves, the episcopate will be encouraged to take a more independent tone, and will feel themselves, in proportion as they do, supported by the Church in a manner which they have not hitherto experienced.

But there is another ground of hope, which we have not hitherto adverted to. The Church holds, in one important respect, a very different place from what she did a century ago. The episcopate was then limited to England and Ireland: it was wholly under the control of the State. No bishop in communion with the Church of England could be consecrated without the royal mandate or license. Every bishop was bound by oaths of allegiance to the English Crown; every bishop was bound to acknowledge the royal supremacy. No synods of bishops could assemble without the royal license; or make regulations, or exercise acts of high jurisdiction, or interfere with authority in Church questions, without the confirmation of King, Lords, and Commons. *That state of things has come to an end!* We now see in Scotland a Church which is thoroughly independent of the State, a Church regularly organized, in full communion with our own, and capable of interfering powerfully in the concerns of the Church of England in any case of necessity. We see in America a powerful and flourishing Church, animated, too, with the spirit of *freedom*; a Church which may be expected to sympathize deeply in all efforts made by the mother Church to obtain a measure of the same freedom which the daughter has acquired. And in the Colonies we see numerous Churches, not tied and fettered, as our own have been; but remote from Government influence, unaided by Government favour, despoiled by Government of their rights, and yet free (as we have heard from the Attorney-general) from the terrors of *præmunire*! In the Colonies the Government has been labouring to teach the Church, that it is not established by the State in preference to any others; and thus the colonial Churches are more at liberty, and may be expected to show that they are so.

Now all this appears to us to have a most important bearing on the Church of England herself. We are no longer an *isolated* Church. The advocates of our religious freedom will no longer be left alone to struggle with a creedless State. If *we* are under the yoke of laws which were adapted for a different age from ours, many of our brethren and our fathers are at liberty. The *majority of the episcopate* is either altogether free, or free to a great extent. And that episcopate possesses *universal* jurisdiction in times of

heresy or infidelity. The decree of a synod in matters of faith or of essential discipline, has authority in every part of the world. Were the whole English episcopate to fail utterly in faith, the episcopate throughout the world could stand in the breach, and create fresh leaders for the cause of Faith. In times of extraordinary peril to faith, there have been many instances of extraordinary exercise of power. Patriarchs have been deposed by synods or bishops of remote provinces; decrees have been made in condemnation of imperial laws and regulations; ordinations and consecrations have been performed by bishops of other provinces; common forms and ordinances have been dispensed with in case of necessity;—in short, the inherent powers of an independent episcopate are very great; and there is such an independent episcopate.

There is yet another ground of hope. The State itself, having no positive principles of its own, is subject to be swayed and guided by external influences. In the contest for power, or for advantage of any kind, the victory is sure to remain with whatever party is so strong and so pertinacious, that its claims become troublesome. If the Church becomes troublesome to the State in the *right* way,—that is, not by any such direct opposition as would enable the State to strike a blow and weaken its petitioner, but by such a course of steady complaint, petition, remonstrance, censure, argument, and appeal to popular, fair, legal, and intelligible rights, claims, and securities; and so firm a resolution to have them granted, and to disregard all threats, intimidations, inducements, or bribes that may be held out; that it is evident the petitioner cannot be cajoled, or induced to defer the petition;—if this should be the case, we think the eventual success of the Church morally certain, when we look at the *usual* course of legislation under such circumstances. A measure is proposed; it is rejected by Government and a large party; this is repeated several times; at length Government becomes its advocate, to get rid of an annoyance, and then it is passed. The Church has only to seek for her rights, and they will be obtained. Let her bring any large amount of force to bear continually and perseveringly on the question, and she may get any thing she wishes. She may gain free synods, and she may gain free elections of bishops. She cannot have either one or the other at present; but she can have them both in a few years, if she acts wisely.

In entering on the contest, however, for the restoration of the Church's rights, with a view to the security of religion, it is difficult to foresee exactly what course the contest may take, as regards the temporalities of the Church. We see no ground on which the State could even threaten the temporalities of the

Church, if the course adopted by Churchmen, in pursuit of her liberties, were strictly legal, or such as, at all events, is practically so, from its general adoption by others. We do not think that, in the present day, the mere seeking for rights, which have been illegally suppressed (such as the meeting of convocation), or for free elections of bishops and deans, could be made a pretext for any intimidation; or that public feeling would bear out any government in any attack, either on property or on personal liberty. Every part of the law or constitution is open to revision; and as long as the law is not directly opposed, there can be no means of assailing the Church. Besides this, the great patronage enjoyed by the Crown, independently of the bishoprics and deaneries, and the patronage enjoyed by private individuals, and which no one proposes to touch, would be another guarantee. And, in fine, if the Church had sufficient power to carry her own liberation, she would have power enough to retain her property.

Such appears to us to be the most probable side of the question; but, at the same time, we think that the Church ought deliberately to make up her mind for whatever may happen, and to be ready to persevere in her demands, even if the result should be the confiscation of her whole temporalities. Grievous as such a blow would be, it would be a cause of *thankfulness*, if it saved us from the formation and perpetuation of a latitudinarian and infidel Church; a Church like that of Germany, having the name of Christianity, without its belief; a Church which admitted freely within its bosom Rationalists and Mystics, the Pantheist and the Materialist. There could be but one element to add horror to such a mixture,—the voluntary union of Christians with such a mass of corruption.

We would a thousand times prefer seeing all the temporalities of the Church destroyed, than see an established Infidelity like that of Germany.

In this view we should esteem it a calamity, if the minds of those who are firm in faith were brought to the adoption of such a course, as should lead to their exclusion from the possession of the benefices and positions which they hold in the Church at present; because the result would be, that their places would be filled by men of different principles, and the Church would receive an impulse in the very direction which is most perilous to her. To suppose the existence of a state of things analogous to what occurred in the time of the Non-jurors; to suppose the endowments of the Church, and all its advantages, and, above all, its *connexion with the people*, to remain in unsafe hands, would be, indeed, a deplorable view, and such a result the very clearest necessity alone could justify—such necessity as should be announced by the orthodox episcopate

throughout the world. No; if we are to lose our temporalities, let us all fall together, and all start fair again. But do not let *our* fall be the means of giving the people into the hands of infidelity.

We trust that in any case in which the duty of Churchmen appeared doubtful, they would weigh well the evil, on one side, of being amalgamated with infidelity; and, on the other, the evil of giving over the people into the hands of infidelity; and we have no doubt that their course would be guided aright. But we see no prospect of any such conjuncture of circumstances. The faith of the Church is firm and unwavering, notwithstanding the failure, feebleness, timidity, and indifference of many amongst us. All that possesses energy is firm in its faith. And we think that there is reason to expect the increase of this firm and steadfast faith, instead of its diminution.

We now come to the steps which are being actually taken for the recovery of the Church's liberties. The great object immediately before the Church at present, is the revival of her convocations, as the form of synod recognized by the latest precedents.

The State has for 130 years virtually suppressed these assemblies, by refusing its license for their deliberations, and exercising its influence over the archbishops, so as to prevent them from meeting except as matter of form. That the State will alter the unjust policy which it has so long persisted in, in this respect, without the application of very strong influence, is not to be expected. The Archbishop of Canterbury at present leaves the question, as he has informed some of the clergy, entirely to the discretion of the Government. We must expect, therefore, that for some time, the applications made to revive convocation will be unsuccessful. The prayers of the Church will be refused by the State, and the archbishops: but, supposing the State and the archbishops to refuse to permit convocation to act, their objections will doubtless be founded on the apprehensions of the one, lest the Church should interfere with its legislation on Church subjects; and the fear of the others, lest it should increase divisions in the Church, and endanger her temporalities.

Now, it is the judgment of those who are favourable to a restoration of the constitutional liberties of the Church in respect of synods, that either such apprehensions are altogether groundless, or else that they are not cause of alarm, or else that they must be disregarded in comparison with still greater perils. The great majority of the Church are, beyond question, favourable to the restoration of the synodal action of the Church in some form.

Differing, then, as we should in the supposed case, from the

advisers of the Crown, (and yet those advisers being invested by law with the absolute power of preventing the meeting of convocation,) what is our course to be? We think it may be thus, in general, described.

The object of the Crown advisers in the supposed case, being to keep matters in a certain state, which they think would be disturbed by the meeting of convocation, it should be the policy of the Church, we think, to show that, notwithstanding the illegal and unconstitutional suppression of the regular assemblies of the Church, the *very same disturbance* which Government apprehends from convocations or synods, may exist and become permanent, notwithstanding the suppression of synods; and then, possibly, the assembling of synods may, after a time, be looked to rather as a *remedy*, than as an evil.

With this view, the organization of the Church by means of voluntary associations of clergy and laity, should be made as perfect as possible, so that no ecclesiastical division should be left without the means of prompt co-operation with the whole body, on any given point. The little which has been done as yet in this direction, proves the power which arises from such union and co-operation; and the movements of the Government, and certain indications in Parliament, show that the rise and increase of this power is felt with uneasiness. This is exactly as it should be. We shall never gain any thing, until far greater uneasiness is felt. Nothing will ever be gained, unless the agitation of the mind of the Church be such as to create considerable alarm, irritation, and disturbance "elsewhere" for several years. The Church must be prepared for intimidation, threats, insults, and possibly hostile legislation, with a view to bind her down more firmly, before she can look for relief. A steady continuance in the course which has been already adopted in part, but with increased vigour, will eventually obtain the restitution of Church liberties from the State.

But in order to obtain this, largely increased exertions must be made. The organization of the Church must be completed. No opportunity of resisting bad legislation must be lost. Nothing must be permitted to proceed either in Church or State with respect to Church questions, without a vigilant scrutiny, and a vigorous *action* either for or against it. The press must be kept at work in every way. In proportion to the vigour with which this course is taken, combined with such reasonable discretion as shall evade *all transgression of the laws* of Church and State, will be the success of the undertaking.

It will thus be seen, that if the object of the ministers in the unconstitutional repression of the Church's synodal action be to obtain

a body which shall be subservient and accommodating—a body which shall exercise no will or judgment of its own, but be led and guided exactly as the State pleases, they will be wholly disappointed. They will be able to influence a certain portion of the Church by their corrupt exercise of patronage, but they will not be able to keep the Church, as a body, from being extremely troublesome to them in every direction. They will have to deal with a body which is smarting under a sense of continued wrong, and a body which will not be disposed to look with a friendly eye on any of the movements of Government while this wrong continues—a jealous, alienated, active, and powerful body—a body which is continually gaining strength, and which will soon be no subject for contempt to any Government.

Such, in general, is the line of policy which, judging by the course of events passing before our eyes, we may reasonably expect to be effectual in wringing from a reluctant State the restitution of the Church's rights. We have no strength to compel the surrender of the citadel by main force, but we may beleaguer it, and leave it no rest or peace until it makes terms.

It is, of course, advisable, in the first instance, to seek from the *Crown* the restoration of the synod, which has been suspended, by an arbitrary and unconstitutional exercise of the royal prerogative, in violation of the coronation oath, for 130 years. This will be sought by various bodies of Churchmen. It has been so already. It is being sought by a great assembly of the clergy and laity from all parts of the kingdom. But it appears to us desirable that some additional agency should be brought into play for giving a more formal and authoritative character to the movement for freedom. At present, if the aggregate clergy and laity of England meet for any purpose, they assemble, once for all, in a great meeting, bearing no directly representative character, and having no continuous existence. There may be some advantages in this; and yet we should wish, if possible, to give those proceedings something of a more formal, and authoritative, and continuous character; we shall be glad to see some body of Churchmen which might act directly on the State as the recognized organ of Church feeling, and might lead the efforts of Churchmen for the attainment of Church objects. The "Church Unions" have not this kind of *semi-authoritative* character; they are mere voluntary combinations of individuals, and, admirably useful and effective as they are in their sphere of operation, they yet can scarcely, at present, stand before the world in such a position as to claim to be in themselves the representatives of the Church. They are not so much *provisional*

bodies, acting merely until the regular synods are restored, and holding some *intermediate* authority, as the fortuitous combination of individuals associated under circumstances of extreme peril and necessity. Now we think that there is a want of some body possessing a *species* of authority, capable, in short, of filling the space left vacant by the synod, in some provisional and semi-authoritative mode, until the synod itself is replaced in the full exercise of its liberties. And such a want we conceive might be supplied by some such measure as the following.

It would be *illegal* to summon a convocation without the Queen's writ; therefore, a convocation, in the supposed case, we could not have. A national synod *might*, we believe, be summoned by the archbishops, for the submission of the clergy, and the consequent Act of Henry VIII. makes no mention of "synods;" but, of course, no archbishop *would* take such a step, even if he could. We see nothing, however, in the Acts of Parliament to prevent the assembling of a voluntary "convention of the clergy *and* people of the Church of England, Ireland, and the Colonies"—a "convention," not claiming the *legal* authority of a convocation or a synod; not claiming the right to "make rules, orders, or constitutions, in causes ecclesiastical, without the king's authority" (Canon XII.); but being, and assuming to be, the virtual and actual representation of the clergy and people of the Church; and as such, *authorized* to represent the wishes, and prayers, and grievances of the Church, and to interfere on behalf of the Church, and, to enter into treaties on her behalf, to issue recommendations and suggestions to the Church, and to receive petitions, and to enter into communications with the American, Scottish, and Colonial Churches. A body thus composed of laity, as well as of clergy, could not come under any "submission" made in the time of Henry VIII., because there were not any bodies of such mixed character then in being; and where the rights of any part of the nation to meet for purposes, consistent with obedience to the laws, are concerned, it is only fair, we think, that statutes should be taken in their strict and literal meaning, and not be stretched so as to restrain the liberty of the subject unnecessarily. As to any *moral* obligation on the clergy to adhere to the "submission" in the time of Henry VIII., the suppression of synods for 130 years by the Crown has annulled any such obligation. The "submission" would never have been made on any such terms.

Of whom should such a convention be composed? We should say, it should include (1) all archbishops, metropolitans, and bishops within the British dominions, whether at home or in the colonies, who were inclined to take part in its deliberations; (2)

all deans and archdeacons similarly disposed ; (3) proctors for the chapters ; (4) proctors for the clergy of each diocese, in proportion to the archdeaconries, elected by beneficed clergy ; (5) proctors for the universities ; and (6) deputies for the people of each diocese, elected by communicants. In each of these instances of election, many of the electors would not at first exercise their right, being unfavourable to any such Convention ; but this need not prevent others from acting.

Whether any bishops or archbishops would, at first, take part in the proceedings of such a convention would be doubtful. The same may be said of the greater number of deans and archdeacons ; probably very few of either would take part in the convention at first. The number would, however, increase after a time, if the proceedings of the convention assumed a character of importance, in consequence of their energy, discretion, moderation, and success. The recognition of the character of the convention by episcopal authority in Scotland, America, and the Colonies would also give it weight ; and the progress of events might very probably induce some bishops and other dignitaries, by degrees, to take part with the convention.

It would not be *necessary*, however, in any degree, to the success of the design, that the bishops should ostensibly take part in it, and actually sit in the convention : business could be transacted in their absence ; and as the object of the convention would not be any authoritative enactments, but merely the recovery of the rights of the Church, the presence of the episcopate would not be requisite as a matter of principle. There would, however, be this important consideration, that the bishops could, at any moment that they thought fit, *confer* an authoritative character on the assembly by uniting themselves with it, in which case the convention would be competent to any acts of spiritual jurisdiction that might be requisite, *on any emergency*. Such a body, composed of the episcopate and the representatives of the clergy and people, might, *at any moment*, without an hour's delay, declare itself a national synod, and act as such.

If this body were called into existence, it would be desirable to give it such a character as should assimilate it in some degree to the regular Convocations of the Church. Its proceedings should commence with the Convocation prayers, if legally permissible : a Prolocutor should be elected : its clerical members should appear in their robes. Its proceedings should be of a grave and formal character, like those of a Convocation or Parliament. It should appoint its select and other committees, delegates, and deputations—issue its writs for elections, through its Prolocutor,—nominate its civilians, and counsel, and consulting theologians ;

its treasurers and secretaries, and other officers,—and raise funds to meet its expenses.

With reference to elections of proctors and deputies, we should imagine that some such course as this might be taken. The proctors for cathedral bodies might be chosen by such residentiaries, non-residentiaries, or honorary canons, as might be in favour of a Convention. The deputies for universities would be chosen at meetings of members of their convocation, or senate. The proctors for the clergy and laity might be chosen at meetings summoned for the purpose by the archdeacon, or some of the rural deans, or such other persons as might be commissioned; each of the clergy being requested also to convene the communicants of his parish, and cause them to elect a layman to represent them. Each of the clergy and laity so convened, and every member of the convention, should subscribe to a declaration of their wish to obtain the restoration of the liberties of the Church, throughout Great Britain and its dependencies, in reference to synods, and elections of bishops and other prelates; such declaration being subscribed and attested, the right of proxy might be permitted, and the elections be decided by the votes of those present; each having a number of votes in proportion to the proxies held by him from his own deanery.

And then the question arises,—Whence should the power to summon such a convention be derived? We think it might proceed from a general assembly of clergy and laity, which could appoint a committee authorized to carry out all the details of the proposal, and to regulate all the proceedings, prior to, and on the meeting of such a convention.

Such a body as this would, we conceive, in no degree supersede the action of “Church Unions;” but, in fact, become the authoritative organ of all that feeling which Church Unions represent, and which they have, and would continue to have, well-founded claims to direct. The Church Unions would necessarily be in very close union with any such body: they would continue all their present action; and the convention would give weight to all. The agencies then in operation for the recovery of the Church’s rights would be (1) the Church Unions; (2) the ecclesiastical organization, under archdeacons and rural deans, as far as it can be made available; (3) the General Convention of the clergy and laity.

The benefit of the Church Unions, as it seems to us, is to set other machinery to work; to infuse the spirit of activity into the old organization of the Church; to aid in directing and advising the proceedings taken under that organization; and to act generally in making the existing machinery available. But when Church

Unions come before Parliament, or the Crown, or the Public, we think they have less weight, because they have no organization known to the public, and assume no character which gives authority to their representations. Such an assembly as we have described would have the highest claim to attention. We have no doubt that amongst its lay members might be found a large body of nobility, members of Parliament, jurists, and other distinguished and influential men.

The Convention should, we think, start into existence on the refusal of the Crown to grant Convocation, either directly, or by some evasion of the demand. It should then proceed to place itself in communication with the episcopate and churches throughout the world, and obtain their judgment on the position of the Church of England under the existing laws. It should seek for their alliance and aid. It should head the supplications of the Church of England for common justice, and for the relief of grievances. It should present to the nation an assembly scarcely less important, in its way, than the legislature itself: a body exercising influence independent of the Crown and of the Parliament, and far more active, united, and powerful than Convocation itself, as at present constituted, could be. Its voice should be heard in protest and remonstrance on all occasions when the security of the faith and discipline of the Church was invaded, or its temporal rights imperilled. Its missionaries should go forth to proselytize the whole people to the cause of Church freedom. In strict combination with the Church Unions, and with local organization of the Church in England, and with the sister churches in Scotland and in America, and the Colonies,—and with, at least, a portion of the English episcopate, which will assuredly adhere to the cause of God, even when it may be necessary to disregard the threats, ay, and the persecution, of “the powers that be,”—that Convention of the Church might bravely stem the torrent, and, at length, re-instate the Church of England in the full possession of her ancient Liberties and Rights.

Let us briefly indicate the course which might be pursued for the recovery of our rights.

The first appeal should be to the Crown. Ere these pages are before the public this appeal will have been made. It will consist in the moderate request—that Convocation may be permitted to deliberate on the questions now before the Church.

The next step, we conceive, might be, to summon a General Convention of the Church, in the mode suggested above.

After this, the appeal to the Crown might be renewed with more vigour; requesting not merely that a Synod may be assem-

bled, but that the Ministers be directed to introduce a Bill for restoring free elections of bishops and deans.

This appeal might be backed by any numerical force in the shape of petitions from clergy and laity, that might be deemed advisable.

The next step, in case of failure in the preceding, might be, to apply to the Legislature for the repeal of the Acts conferring on the Crown the powers which it holds at present, and for the restoration of the liberty of elections and free Synods, according to the ancient law of England.

In case of failure, an appeal might be made to the episcopate and Churches of the English communion throughout the world, to declare their judgment on the existing state of the law in England.

A final appeal might then be made to the English Legislature for justice.

In case of failure, it would then remain to appeal to the orthodox episcopate throughout the world, to enforce their judgment by spiritual censures—to exclude from their communion all who adhered to the existing law, or did not pronounce condemnation of it—to depose all archbishops and bishops who might adhere to it—and to consecrate bishops in their place.

In this event, the Church of England might be wholly deprived of its churches and endowments; but they would be enjoyed only by deposed and excommunicated sectaries, whose possession would probably be as short-lived as their faith was unsound. Either their property would be soon swept away by the revolutionary spirit of the times, or the Church of England would, after a time, re-enter on its possessions. Rationalism and Evangelicalism would soon break up the Parliamentary establishment; the Church of England would ultimately gain the adherence of all right-minded Evangelicals, against whom the door should never be closed; and a Rationalistic church would be unable to maintain its ground.

If, in any event, the Church of England and the State establishment should become two different bodies, we are anxious that it should be under such circumstances, that the Christian world may see that so great an evil has not taken place without sufficient warning and sufficient cause. Our sole anxiety is, that the course taken may be such as shall be justifiable by the imperative necessity of protecting the Christian faith; and that no hasty, impetuous, or impatient actions—no voluntary separations—no schisms unauthorized by the *orthodox* episcopate, and arising from our own individual sense of right—should mar, and impede, and disfigure our testimony for “the faith of JESUS CHRIST.”

It is for this reason that we should regret to see any members of the Church at present attempt to forsake us, and to combine in a new communion. There is nothing in our present state that could warrant any such course, or exempt it from the imputation of schism. It may be said by them, that the supreme ecclesiastical court in England has pronounced against the faith of the Church concerning baptism. Be it so: yet it cannot be said that the Church has *acquiesced* in any such decision. Protests have been heard in many directions, and at this moment we are appellants to the decision of a Synod. Let the Synod meet, and we shall have all doubts put an end to. But while this appeal is pending, separation would be obviously without sufficient cause or justification. Let it be conceded that heresy has received encouragement by the recent decision, yet still the Church has to speak. It is at this moment gagged and bound by the Government: it will not long be so. Causeless divisions now would only have the effect of placing those who make them in a false position, and of precluding them from taking any part in the contest which the Church has commenced.

Let it not be supposed that, in offering this advice, we are insensible to the dangers of faith. We see those dangers distinctly. We see a deeper, larger, and more urgent danger, perhaps, than some of those do, who would forsake the Church on account of the recent decision. We are convinced that the *real* contest is between Christianity and Infidelity. But, in proportion to the magnitude of the question, is the anxiety we feel, that the advocates of the cause of *faith* in the Church of England should present an unbroken front; and that their proceedings should, throughout, be so plainly guided by reason; so evidently based in justice, faith, charity, and necessity, that there may be nothing for which the Church of England may hereafter have to blame her defenders; but that our cause may stand before the English nation, and before all Christendom, as a holy, and a righteous, and a just cause; that there may be no fundamental defects in our proceedings, which may hereafter be made the means of disturbing the faith, by assailing the ecclesiastical position of the Church of England.

Most fervently do we pray, that it may never be our lot to witness so lamentable a struggle for faith, though that struggle would be a glorious one. But the members of the Church have convictions and consciences too; and earnestly do we hope, that this may be discovered before it is too late; and that the timely concession of those liberties which have become essential to the preservation of religion, will prevent the fearful consequences to Church and State, which must otherwise ensue.

ART. V.—*The Guardian*: Wednesday, June 5, 1850.

The Morning Post: Tuesday, June 4, 1850.

THE introduction of the Bishop of London's Bill for a Reform of the Tribunal for the decision of Doctrinal Causes, and the debate in the House of Lords which ensued, are amongst the most important, and, in many respects, amongst the most cheering, of the events which the Church has lately witnessed. In the Bill itself, and in the debate, there was a healthy tone such as we have long been strangers to; and although, as might have been anticipated, the measure failed, in consequence of the opposition of Government, still we have reason to be most deeply grateful to the Right Reverend author of the Bill, and to the prelates and nobles who so worthily supported him: and it is with feelings which we are unable to express that we recognize the guidance of the Divine HEAD OF THE CHURCH in bringing about the unanimity which on this occasion has so happily, and so wonderfully, been manifested by the Bishops of England.

While all Churchmen must honour the integrity, the ability, and the perfect soundness of principle which the Bishop of London's advocacy of the measure evinced, we trust that the present failure of this most righteous and healing Bill will not be found to have the injurious effects which his Lordship anticipated. Assuredly the failure of *any* measure in the present day which is intended for the restitution of the Church's rights can afford but little matter of surprise; nor can it, to any reasonable mind, produce any material difference in the view which he takes of his duties to the Church. The State has retained—wrongfully and unjustly retained—the powers which were given to it when it was a Christian State, perfectly united in faith to the Church of England. The State is obviously determined to retain those powers as long as it can. It will offer a most obstinate resistance to all attempts to eject it from the powers it unjustly holds; and it has the law, the parliament, and the majority of the nation in its favour, at present. Therefore it will, without scruple, resist every attempt that the Church makes to get rid of its fetters. Again and again we shall be frustrated; and it is only by perseverance that the claims of justice and of religion will make their way. We should think, therefore, that the failure of this Bill, at

present, cannot produce any effect in causing persons to fall away from the Church, except in so far as every evidence of the State's actual power over the Church is to some minds a cause of doubt and of danger.

But we will say, with confidence, that we think the Bishop of London, and the archbishops and bishops of England, have done very much to reassure the minds of Churchmen generally, by the mere *fact* of agreeing to introduce such a Bill.

It is needless for us to enter into the details of the proposed Bill, as our readers must be familiar with them. Suffice it to say, that the important feature in the whole was, that all doctrinal questions were to be transferred by the Privy Council to the cognizance of a spiritual tribunal, consisting of the bishops of England; and that the duty of the Privy Council was restricted to advising the Crown to carry the decision of the spiritual tribunal into effect. So that, substantially and really, while the theoretical supremacy of the Crown was upheld, just as it is now, with all the usual forms, the power of settling matters of doctrine was transferred, from a mere State tribunal without any creed, to a synod of bishops. The supremacy was, so far, practically transferred to the proper hands. The bishops were not to be called in merely as members of the Privy Council, or as mere advisers of the Privy Council, or of the Queen in Council; but they were to act as bishops, in their separate court, and *practically* holding their independent and rightful sovereignty in spiritual matters by law. The Church was, through them, to protect her own faith. The religion of the Church of England was no longer to be left at the discretion of a set of lawyers and politicians who were thoroughly indifferent to religious truth, and who regarded all questions that might arise with the eyes of men of the world and statesmen, and with the policy of relaxing to the utmost degree the stringency of Church formularies. The Church itself was to look after its own faith. That very unenlightened body, still attached to the belief of the fourth and the sixteenth century, was to have the power of preventing Rationalists, Socinians, Infidels, Anabaptists, and all opponents of the faith, from becoming possessed of her benefices and ministering at her altars.

Now we do say, that the mere introduction of a Bill embodying such principles as these is a great benefit to the Church. It is an assertion of right and of principle. It is a declaration that the power of the State in reference to spiritual matters is too great—is dangerously great—and must be diminished. It is a recognition of the principle, that the royal supremacy, however excellent in theory, cannot practically be trusted—that it must be guarded against.

It is a recognition, too, of the justice of the apprehensions of those who regard the Judicial Committee of Privy Council as a dangerous and incompetent tribunal.

That such a Bill as this should have been introduced, and with the almost unanimous consent of the hierarchy, is, indeed, a subject of the highest gratification, and of some surprise also; for it was not supposed that the principles of reform had made so great a progress. And although we may readily believe that some of the supporters of that Bill have looked at it chiefly as a means for allaying the excitement which recent events have caused, yet still we do not suppose, that any of them can have failed to remark the real and substantial alteration and reform in essential points which it would make in the present relations of Church and State.

We cannot but marvel, however, that of all the bishops and archbishops of England in favour of the bill, two only, the Bishops of London and Oxford, spoke in its behalf. When we compare the interest excited by great questions in the House of Commons, and the anxiety of members to speak for or against measures of importance, we must certainly infer that, at present at least, ecclesiastical topics are not subjects of much interest in the House of Lords. To this indeed the Bishop of London seemed to allude at the commencement of his speech:—

“He had to submit to their earnest and serious consideration a measure far less interesting, he feared, than the ordinary topics which generally engaged the attention of the house.”

Unless we are greatly deceived in “the signs of the times,” we think this want of interest is not likely very long to continue. We expect to see Parliament as much excited on Church questions in a year or two, as they used to be on Catholic Emancipation. Up to the present time, however, it is evident that on Church subjects there is a great amount of indifference in the House of Lords as well as in the House of Commons. Church questions can only attract a slight interest. And yet this is our sole legislature for the Church! We are deprived by arbitrary power of our natural and constitutional legislature, and thrown for legislation on bodies which are indifferent to us, which feel no anxiety for our welfare. We cannot conceive that any thing but their knowledge of the temper of the house, and its unwillingness to hear lengthened discussions on Church subjects, could have withheld all our bishops, save three, from speaking on an occasion of such vital importance and unparalleled interest.

The Bishop of London, in the earlier part of his speech, drew

attention to the benefits accruing to the State from the Church's possession of Christian liberty.

“He must attempt to induce their lordships to lay aside for a short season their thoughts and feelings as mere legislators, and to apply themselves to this question as members of that great spiritual body, the Church. It must not be supposed that he desired their lordships to put out of sight for a single moment, whilst legislating for the Church, the relation which the Church bore to the State, or the mutual claims and duties of the two. It was because he believed that it was *essential to the well-being of the State* that the Church should be enabled *to discharge its own peculiar functions without let or hindrance*, that he desired their lordships to direct their attention—perhaps somewhat more closely than they were wont to do—to the functions of the Church, as the keeper and teacher of God's truth.”

A State like that of England does not understand what is most for its own interest, when it attempts to interfere with the internal concerns of any Church within its dominions. Whenever it has done so, disturbance has invariably been the result. Romanists would not tolerate its meddling in their affairs, nor Dissenters in theirs; because they are justly and reasonably jealous of the interference of a power which is alien in religion from themselves. The State has, for a long series of years, had very little difficulty in dealing with these various classes of sectarians. It takes care not to offend them by disturbing their internal arrangements, doctrines, &c. But what would be the state of things, if it were to put itself in the position of appointing their ministers, interfering with their endowments, prescribing rules for their education and worship, deciding questions of doctrine amongst them, and suppressing their synods and meetings in order to draw all power into its own hands? The answer is obvious: it would be most certainly, ignominiously repulsed. It does not possess power to carry out any such interference.

And now to look to the Church of England. We were long at peace with the State, because the State was of our own faith, and for the most part acted in such a way as to cause little jealousy or uneasiness to the Church. But twenty years ago it threw off the religion of the Church of England, and it has never since been at peace with the Church. There has been frequent collision between Church and State, and it is daily becoming more open and violent. And why so? Because the State does not maintain towards the Church the same distance as it does towards all the sects, contenting itself with mere protection of its endowments, and relinquishing interference in its internal affairs. Let it *reform* relations which were established for, and are only

suited to a Church of England State, and let a creedless State acknowledge, in the case of the Church of England, the same religious liberties which it is *compelled* to yield to every other denomination of Christians. The State has never yielded religious liberty to any communion except on compulsion, and with the extremest reluctance. Let it now show that the examples of all enlightened governments are not lost on it, that the invariable issue of such contests is not forgotten, that its legislative intelligence is not limited by the precedents of the sixteenth century, and that it has, if no regard for justice—common justice, and fairness, yet at least some regard for its own quiet; and, as it has degenerated to the latitudinarianism of America and of France, let it imitate the conduct of either of those States in not interfering with the religious concerns of those who *have* a creed.

The Bishop of London discharged a most difficult task with singular address and good feeling, in pointing out the unfitness of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council for the decision of doctrinal questions.

“When they came to deal with ecclesiastical questions, it was seen that it was not a tribunal constituted according to the original principles of the Church, and—with respect be it spoken—he must say that the members were not competent judges of such questions. He apprehended that, in the constitution of an ecclesiastical tribunal, the State and Church could only have these objects in view; and it was because there was a departure from these objects that he now called on their lordships, not to remodel the proceedings of that court, but to give some directions for its mode of procedure in certain cases. He said that it was the duty of the State, *looking at its compact with the Church*, to preserve inviolate that *compact*, and to preserve intact the doctrines and discipline of the Church, and to keep all ecclesiastical judges within the terms of that compact. On the other hand, he considered that it was the duty of the Church to preserve inviolate its doctrines and purely spiritual discipline, and to do this without the danger of coming into collision with the State. The whole course of his argument proceeded upon this assumption. He must say that *we were the only Church in Europe which was deprived of the freedom of synodical deliberation*. He thought the judicial committee was an incompetent tribunal for deciding questions of doctrine,” &c.

Undoubtedly there was a *compact*, or an understanding and virtual engagement between the Church of England and the State. That is to say, in the reign of Henry VIII., the Church relinquished the power of assembling in convocation without the royal summons, and yielded up her right of free elections to the Crown, and recognized the Crown as supreme head of the Church, as far as was allowable by God's law—on the assumption, condi-

tion, and implied engagement of the Crown, that its power should always be employed for the maintenance of true religion, as held and taught by the Church of England. From that compact the Crown has departed, having consented to let its powers pass into the hands of a body which has no creed at all. Certainly the compact of the State with the Church involved, as the Bishop of London observed, the duty of "preserving intact the doctrines and discipline of the Church." Is the State doing this? Can it attempt to do so? It cannot, because it has no belief. Therefore it seems plain that the *compact* is at an end. The State having broken its part of the compact in the most essential point of all, the Church is no longer bound. A *new* compact must be formed. And how has it happened, that we are, as the bishop says, "the only Church in Europe deprived of the freedom of synodical deliberation?" It has been, simply, because the State has broken its compact with the Church—it has abused, for the destruction of the Church's liberties, a power which was only given for the honour of the Crown, on the supposition that it would be justly and righteously used. All compact on the subject of synods is clearly at an end now, at the end of one hundred and thirty years of its breach by the State.

The Bishop of London stated indeed a most striking and remarkable fact, in reference to the want of freedom of synodical deliberation in the Church of England. His lordship might have added that, while our synods are arbitrarily suppressed, no one has a right to blame those who associate for the restoration of the Church's liberties, or for the protection of her rights, in voluntary societies. Let the Church have the free exercise of those rights of synodical deliberation which the law gives her, and we shall have no more unions and meetings; but, when our legal rights are withheld, we must reclaim them as best we may, by those means and ways which the constitution still leaves to us for obtaining redress of grievances.

This brings us to Lord Lansdowne's speech in reply to the Bishop of London, in which the views of the Government on the Bill were fully and clearly stated. He objected to the Bill, first, because it would tend to damage the authority of the decision recently pronounced in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, which the Government intend to remain undisturbed as the legal and final decision on the subject, governing, of course, all similar and analogous cases; secondly, because the Bill would be an interference with the royal prerogative which "the Church of England herself" had repeatedly acknowledged; and thirdly, because there would be a risk of the minority of bishops in any decision being treated as heretics by the majority, and of the

public looking to doctrinal qualifications in the appointment of bishops.

In short, the Government has plenty of reasons, such as they are, for refusing a bill they do not like. It would, we believe, be wasting breath to argue with them; but the Church and country at large have not exactly the *same* kind of interest in the matter that the Government has, and are more open to reason. We shall offer therefore a few remarks on the line taken by the Government. In the first place, it is evident that they are *resolved* to maintain and carry out the principle contained in the decision in the Gorham case. They are determined to make it the law of the land, and to let nothing shake it. This is quite obvious, and it is well that it should be so. We see what is to be expected from Government. Nothing that can offer a prospect of reversing that decision will be assented to: therefore no *convocation* will be permitted to deliberate. Such is simply our position. The State is determined to *force* upon the Church that decision, with all that it contains—with all its perilous latitudinarianism—with its principle that our formularies are to be applied, *not* with a view to truth or falsehood, nor even with a view to their agreement or disagreement of doctrine with tenets under trial, but in the most loose, vague, and indefinite way that may be devised for the purpose of including the greatest possible number of different tenets in the Church. Such is the determination of the Government, which exercises the supremacy over the Church.

As regards the argument for the supremacy against the Bill, we really wonder that ministers have the face to talk of the “royal supremacy” as likely to suffer, when all the world knows that it is their *own* supremacy that is in question: but, putting this aside, we must offer one passing remark; we warn those who are for ever throwing the “supremacy” in our teeth, that they are not serving the supremacy by this course. If they wish to preserve the supremacy, they would act most wisely in not drawing inquiry to the subject. As it is, the Church finds that, on every occasion when she seeks relief from grievance, or security for her faith, it is the “royal supremacy” that is in her way. The “royal supremacy” is invariably the bar to prevent our obtaining common justice, or even being treated with common courtesy. The “supremacy” is made to carry far too great a weight; and it will infallibly break down under that burden, if this course is persisted in. If the Crown’s “supremacy” is to withhold from us the enjoyment of those rights and liberties to which we are just as much entitled as any class of Her Majesty’s subjects, we shall be obliged to petition for relief from a “supre-

macy," which has been *already abolished by law* in the case of every denomination but ourselves.

The appeal of Lord Lansdowne to the Church herself, in maintenance of the supremacy, is plausible, but valueless :—

" My lords, it is most important that your lordships should recollect, that the power of the Crown in governing the Church is one which, in all times before the Reformation, at the Reformation, and since the Reformation, was acknowledged *even by the Church itself*, and formed one of the most essential prerogatives of the Crown."

We grant that this power was acknowledged, and rightly acknowledged; but it was always conceived to reside in an orthodox sovereign exercising his royal powers for the maintenance of the faith, and the repression of heresy and schism. And this has nothing in common with a supremacy exercised by an oligarchy nominated by Parliament, neither one nor the other having, as such, any distinctive creed at all. We trust that men will soon be able to discern the hollowness of this appeal to the recognition of the supremacy in former times. As soon as the Government, and others who trade upon the "supremacy," have once been fairly met in argument on this subject in Parliament, they will find that silence, in regard to the supremacy, would be their safest policy. We have no wish to see the Crown deprived of any of its titles or honours; therefore we advise the ministers and others to leave the supremacy alone, and to refrain from introducing it as a means of preventing the Church from attaining securities for its faith. The Crown will assuredly suffer, if its prerogative is, on all occasions, made a pretext for disregarding the wishes and rejecting the petitions of the Church; if its very name becomes identified, in the Churchman's mind with all that is most offensive to his feelings, perilous to his faith, and injurious to his Church; if it is made the pretence for refusing him equal justice with persons of other denominations, and for treating him with arrogance and insult. If this is to be the effect of the royal supremacy, we fear it will come to be regarded as a badge of slavery, both bodily and mental, and its downfall will then be secured.

We are not contemplating an imaginary case. This has been regularly and systematically the course adopted for some time by the State towards the Church, whether in England, Ireland, or the colonies. We are every where treated as spiritual slaves; as the only race of men in the country who have no right to possess consciences, or to have any attention paid to their dictates. The Church *alone* is treated with imperious insolence.

Who can forget the tone and conduct of ministers in the

Hampden case; or the mode in which Lord Palmerston set at nought episcopal authority and Church rights in the question of the Madeira chaplaincy; or the insult offered to the Church in the appointment of individuals to deaneries and bishoprics, here and in Ireland, whose qualification consisted in their opposition to the Church's claim for liberty of instruction; or what has recently occurred—the mandate of Lord Dalhousie to the Church at Madras, to throw open our burial-grounds, and the tone of insolent authority adopted towards the archdeacon on his remonstrance?

Lord Lansdowne is very reluctant that a synod of bishops should decide on doctrinal questions, because the minority might be looked on as heretics, and there might be difficulties in the way of appointing new bishops. Awkward questions might be asked about doctrine. We do not doubt him. We are quite sure the ministry and the Parliament would wish the most ample scope to be given to various doctrines amongst the bishops and clergy. It is exactly what they are anxious to bring about. A creedless State, so closely allied to the Church, must naturally labour to make the Church creedless also. If it can obtain free entrance for doctrines of all kinds into the Church, the Church will be practically creedless, and it will eventually become wholly so by the removal of all subscriptions. This will be necessarily and inevitably the operation of a State without religion upon a Church over which it exercises the supremacy granted to religious sovereigns.

And now we come to Lord Lansdowne's remarks on Convocation. The noble lord is averse to Convocation; he thinks it would damage the Church. He "doubts much whether the revival of Convocation would not materially interfere with peace and tranquillity in the Church." We are really vastly obliged to the Government for their kind consideration for the Church; but would it not be as well, in the first place, to restore us our *rights*, when we ask for them? When the Government has given us back what belongs to us, we shall be more willing to listen to what they have to say; but we think that *restitution* of what has been wrongfully and unconstitutionally taken from us, should precede any advice to us from the actual spoilers.

We have now done with Lord Lansdowne and the Government; but it is curiously characteristic of the times to observe the Earl of Chichester, as a leader of the Evangelical section, coming forward in opposition to the Bishop of London's bill, and thoroughly taking part with Government, more especially on the point of the "supremacy." The Evangelical party is now wholly in the hands of Government, and supports all its most Erastian doctrines. It

dreads the assembling of Convocation, or any free action of the Church, and takes refuge, along with the Rationalistic and Germanizing party, under the skirts of the Government. This is significant, and not without a measure of encouragement to the orthodox.

Then we had the Bishop of St. David's also opposed to the Bill. This prelate represents the "Germanizing" party, the combination of such thinkers as Sterling, Hare, Maurice, and all the other advocates of German theology and philosophical liberty of thought and free speculation on the inspiration of Scripture. Of course this able prelate would be opposed to any bill which tends to promote uniformity of belief. He has always been an advocate for the amplest measure of freedom of opinion. It is difficult indeed to say *where* the line might be drawn by such men.

There seems little calling for remark in the speeches of the other supporters of Government, such as Lords Brougham, Campbell, and Carlisle. On the other side the bill was ably advocated by Lords Lyttelton and Stanley; but the most remarkable speeches by far were those of Lord Redesdale and of the Bishop of Oxford, the tone of which was admirable, and precisely what is now wanted. To Lord Redesdale the warmest gratitude of the Church is due, for the vigour, firmness, and courage of his declarations; and of the Bishop of Oxford's speech we can only say—and we are saying much in speaking thus—that we think his conduct on this occasion is sufficient to redeem every fault that he has committed as a public man since his elevation to the episcopate, and to entitle him to the gratitude and the confidence of the Church.

The tone of Lord Redesdale is so remarkable in some parts of his speech, and the whole is so forcible, plain-spoken, and thoroughly honest, that we must transcribe it at length.

"Lord REDESDALE regretted the change of opinion avowed by the right reverend prelate [Bishop of St. David's]; because it was another instance of that want of courage in the bench of bishops which had led to so much of our present difficulties. What was wanted now was a clear and well-defined statement of the doctrine of the Church: and yet the right reverend prelate seemed to think that the Church might be left to go on, with its ministers holding every variety of opinion. Such a state of things was impossible. It was impossible at the present crisis in the Church that matters could be left to stand as they now were, without more serious evils and more undesirable effects being produced. The right reverend prelate said that the measure was viewed with doubtful satisfaction by both parties; that it was disliked by low churchmen, and regarded by high churchmen only as a step to some ulterior purpose.

He (Lord Redesdale) wished there was no such thing as party in the Church. It was the duty of their lordships, at all events, to disregard party, and to legislate for that body of the Church, that large and important body of men who accepted the Church as the Church, and were willing to be bound by her Articles, her liturgy, her formularies. The course now pursued was, to give a little temporary triumph to the one party or the other, and by that triumph to weaken the Church; for those who were most active in keeping up extreme parties were not the most numerous or the best members of the Church. In petty disputes, perhaps, the right reverend prelate's prescription of letting things take their chance might do no harm; but when the doctrines of the Church were assailed, her usefulness impeded, and her members discouraged and distressed, that was the time for the prelates of the Church to stand forward and pronounce fearlessly and boldly what her doctrines were. At the present moment no man doubted what those doctrines were. Not even the Committee of the Privy Council imagined for a moment that the doctrines held by Mr. Gorham were in accordance with the teaching of the Church. All that they decided was, that Mr. Gorham did not so clearly dissent from that which was laid down in the Articles, liturgy, and formularies, that he ought not to be allowed to hold a living. He begged their lordships to consider this point, for it was one which men did not often put to themselves,—too great liberty to the clergy was injury to the laity. Supposing he (Lord Redesdale) lived in the parish to which Mr. Gorham was appointed, was it no injury to be placed under such a man as that? Not one of the right reverend prelates would say that they entertained the same opinions as Mr. Gorham on the doctrine in dispute: and, indeed, could any one say the doctrine could be held without variance with the Articles, liturgy, and formularies of the Church? By this decision he (Lord Redesdale) would be bound for his whole life under the teaching of a man of notoriously unsound doctrine, and would be bound, with his children and dependents, to submit to it. Were not all the laity who desired to give obedience to those doctrines laid down in the liturgy, articles, &c., in their pure, literal, and natural sense, without any non-natural interpretations, in that position? Their lordships ought to protect the laity against injury from all or any extreme. The right reverend prelate who had just come in (the Bishop of Worcester) very properly withdrew his licence, the other day, from a curate who entertained opinions of a tendency approaching to Rome, and thus protected the parish from teaching contrary to the Church. The right reverend prelate at the table (the Bishop of Exeter) was equally right in refusing to admit an individual who held opinions of another tendency, but equally dissonant from the pure and literal meaning of the Church's formularies, &c. He could tell their lordships, that the decision against the Bishop of Exeter was only looked upon with satisfaction by men of extreme parties; and by none so much as by the Roman Catholics and the most violent dissenters. They viewed it with satisfaction, because they saw that it lowered the Church in the eyes of the world, and enabled them to taunt

those who remained in the Church with denying one of the Articles of the Christian faith. Was that a position in which they ought to be placed? And, being in that position, the bishops ought to come forward to their relief. The objections raised against the Bill, which placed such matters in the hands of the bishops, appeared to him to be unworthy of any great consideration. That which had been suggested, on the ground that the court might be nearly equally divided, thirteen against fourteen, or something like that, he did not believe to be possible. It certainly would not have occurred in regard to the question recently decided. Was a possible difference of opinion any argument against the establishment of a court? He could not conceive a court in which such a contingency was less likely to arise. It would be composed of learned men, all conscious of the sacred duty they would have to perform, and they were not likely to have great differences of opinion. He accepted the Bill, because it constituted the only Church tribunal there appeared to be any chance of getting at the present moment. He had never exhibited any violence of opinion on questions of this kind. No one had stronger objections to any violent change, and no person was more strongly impressed with the danger of continued agitation; and he should therefore have accepted also any alteration in the bill proposed by the Government in a fair manner, and with a disposition to afford relief to the Church. But when he saw the Government come forward to oppose this measure as a party question, he had very little hopes of any thing being done except by the Church bestirring itself in a manner which it had not hitherto done. The necessity for some change had come. Who then could doubt that there was a possibility, nay, that there was a probability that the next person appointed to a bishopric would be Mr. Gorham? That laugh would seem to say that such a thing was impossible; but by far the greater number of appointments recently made had been made with a view of showing the subserviency of the Church to the State. A bishop, not long ago, was appointed who laboured under the censure of his university for heresy; and, if Mr. Gorham was fit to hold a living, he was also fit to hold a bishopric. Every man who reflected upon the condition of the Church must see it could not last, and, with the Government of the day exhibiting such dispositions, he felt bound to avow himself a "reformer" with regard to the present question between Church and State. A large body of earnest men were now rapidly coming to the same conclusion. The relations of Church and State had been materially altered by changes in the latter, and common sense demanded a revision of the subject. He denied that it was any honour or advantage to the Crown, as the Queen, with the most awful responsibility upon her as head of the Church, to have forced upon her by the ministry a most heterodox person. The prosperity of the Church was the strength of the monarchy; and, so far from disloyalty being involved in an advocacy of an alteration in the supremacy, he contended that such a course would, on the contrary, strengthen the Crown. He should support the Bill.

It is seldom, indeed, that we hear this kind of speaking, this honest, independent, truth-telling tone. Lord Redesdale saw his ground distinctly, and with vigorous good sense and thorough sincerity went straight forward to his point, and, by the mere exhibition of plain and undeniable truth, was more effective than if his speech had been garnished with all the graces of rhetoric, and all the subtleties of a lengthened argument. His positions were throughout intelligible, reasonable, and practical. That such a man as Lord Redesdale should have been led to declare himself "a reformer with regard to the present question between Church and State," is a circumstance which shows, in the strongest way, the rapid progress which the cause of Church liberties is making; and which the events of every day are urging forward.

This is the species of reform we now require. We want an adaptation of the law to the altered relations of the State and the Church, in consequence of the State's relinquishment of the Church's creed. Our want is neither more nor less than such a reform as shall give us the power of self-legislation in a free synod, like all other Churches, and the power of choosing our own prelates. Both of those rights were for many ages recognized by the constitution of England; and though the one has been taken from us by the arbitrary abuse of the royal supremacy, and the other by the law, we feel confident that the extreme injustice and grievance of conscience, under which we are now suffering, cannot much longer be continued. We claim religious equality with all other denominations of Christians; and we are resolved to have it. If, for seeking religious liberty, we are liable to obloquy, insult, persecution, and confiscation itself, we are prepared to meet them.

Every one must feel, of course, that the Bishop of London's Bill, however excellent and judicious in itself, cannot relieve the Church from all apprehension as to the decisions of the proposed tribunal hereafter. It would be a perfectly satisfactory tribunal under existing circumstances. But, if Government are to continue to possess the power of naming bishops of their own choice, the Episcopal Bench will gradually become heterodox, or Rationalistic; and thus the judgments of that tribunal will be unsound. But this, of course, is only one branch of the danger resulting to the Church from the absolute power of an unbelieving State in the appointment of our chief pastors; and the possibility of such an event furnishes no objection to the Bill, because it is competent to the Church to seek for the free election of her own bishops. And, that right restored to her, the tribunal becomes as safe from all risk of heterodox or latitudinarian judgments in future, as we firmly believe it would be at this present moment.

- ART. VI.—1. *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter. "The Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, &c."* London: Seeleys. 1850.
2. *A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from the Bishop of EXETER.* London: Murray. 1850.
3. *A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, containing an Examination of his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from WM. GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.* London: Hatchard and Son. 1850.
4. *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on the Position which he has taken in the present Crisis. By WM. DODSWORTH, M.A.* London: Pickering. 1850.
5. *Reasons for not signing the proposed Address to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Worcester, &c., in a Letter to the Rev. J. L. Claughton. By the Rev. H. HASTINGS, M.A.* London: Hatchard and Son. 1850.
6. *A Letter to the Hon. R. Cavendish, on the recent Judgment of the Court of Appeal as affecting the Doctrine of the Church. By JULIUS CHAS. HARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes.* London: Parker. 1850.
7. *A Letter to Archdeacon Hare on the Judgment of the Gorham Case, from the Hon. R. CAVENDISH.* London: Ollivier. 1850.

THE world is going on, to all outward appearance, as usual. Our cities resound with the peaceful din of commerce; our villages and fields with the pleasant voice of labour. Business reigns, as erst, Supreme in the East, and Fashion in the West, of our Metropolis. No angry crowds collect in our thoroughfares. No ferment is visible among the great masses of our population. And yet the halls of our Courts of Justice, the naves of our Churches, and the walls of our Parliament are echoing with cries as thrilling—and only the less tumultuous because the Shibboleth of the Injured is Peace and Love—as ever rent the gates of Palace Yard in 1688, or woke the banks of Forth and Clyde in the spring of 1843.

How much longer even this external veil of things shall continue, who can say? Even now the more thoughtful among us descry signs of danger in the distance. The strongest minds stand

shaken in their holiest convictions. Those distinguished above their fellows for learning and piety are wavering at their posts. Here are people distrusting the teaching of their spiritual pastors, which they had listened to undoubtingly for centuries ;—there ministers, for very fear for their souls, are fleeing from the flocks which were dearer to them than their own right hands, and hastening to an imaginary repose within the pale of a foreign communion. *Peaceful* men, who had never obtruded themselves to the world's gaze, though ever leavening its corruptions, are instant in remonstrances, and bestirring themselves to means of self-defence. *Loyal* men, the constant preachers of subjection to the “ powers that be,” are protesting against the decisions of the highest tribunal of the land. *Patient* men, from whom no amount of personal suffering would have wrung one word of murmuring, are clamorous in their demands for redress to the Church's wrongs. Fundamental Laws of the Church and State stand challenged. The Book of Common Prayer is handled with an avidity, and examined with a subtilty of reasoning, which contrasts strangely with the apathy with which it had previously been regarded. Old Statutes, that had been forgotten, or thought not to exist, are evoked from the slumber to which neglecting generations had consigned them. A controversy unparalleled in obstinacy has, now for years, been splitting the thinking portion of society into two opposite and contending parties, and still seems as far as ever removed from a solution. Where will all this end ?

But besides, and sadder than all this, the natural difficulties of the contest have, as usual, been aggravated by the mutual recriminations, and personal prejudices, which have been interwoven with it. Preachers of righteousness and good-will among men have been hurling the firebrands of discord against each other, and cutting deep with the edge of sarcasm : he, whose indignation was just now fired, because an opponent had passed the bounds of Christian moderation in debate, is himself seen falling on him with the sword of a tenfold virulence. Alas ! why cannot the search after Wisdom be conducted by the process of a passionless argumentation. Alas ! why may we not discuss, and differ from one another, with the unruffled and unruffling energy of a calm Philosophy ? Alas ! that powerful penmen—whose influence for good or ill is so wide—do not or will not see, that every argument they rely on loses half its pungency by the very adjuncts with which they seek to enhance it. Personal invective may pour forth its venom : to bruise and sting it cannot fail. Does it speed on their way to the great goal of Truth its poison-pointed arrows ?

The notorious case of Mr. Gorham, intricate as it ever must have been from the nature of its subject-matter, has been encumbered by collateral questions which, to our mind, never had any thing to do with the real point at issue. Had all the arguments been struck off from either side, which had reference only to the Baptism of adults—which never was a question under discussion¹;—and had it been clearly borne in mind, in all the stages of the controversy, that the essence of it was, not what Scripture, but what the Church of England, had laid down as Truth, that controversy would have ranged, in its legal aspect, within much narrower and more intelligible bounds. Within these bounds, and to that aspect, it is our purpose to confine our remarks, for as a legal question only did it come before the Ecclesiastical Courts at all; and it will then, we apprehend, stand reduced to the following, that is to say, “Whether, according to the Church of England, the grace of Regeneration, (whatever be the exact meaning of that word, of which more presently,) inseparably accompanies the administration of Baptism, in the case of every Infant?” Both parties set out with admitting themselves to be members of the Church of England; both appeal to her Formularies in support of their views; it is upon the footing therefore that she holds Scriptural Truth, that every argument in the case must be taken to proceed².

We are content to view the question through the same media, and to decide it by the same tests, as the Judges of the Judicial Committee have proposed. We agree with them, we take them upon their own terms, that “to ascertain the true meaning and effect of the Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, we must by no means intentionally swerve from the old established rules of construction:” and, again, that “we must apply to the construction of those books the same rules which have been long established, and are by law applicable to the construction of all written instruments.” From those “old established rules of construction” did the Judges, or did they not, in their late Judgment, swerve? Have they, or have they not, followed out their own undertaking? Now we find it laid down as a fundamental Common Law rule for the general interpretation of “all written instruments,” that, “as often as there be no ambiguity in words, there no explanation is to be made contrary to those words³.” Again: “When words are dubious”—*when*, observe, but *not until*—“then it may be

¹ See Sir H. J. Fust’s Judgment, p. 30; and the Bishop of Exeter’s Letter, p. 57.

² “Both sides are agreed in accepting the Prayer Book itself as sound and scriptural.”—Mr. Goode’s Letter, p. 82.

³ “Quoties in verbis nulla ambiguitas, ibi nulla expositio contra verba fienda est.”—2 Saund. Rep. 251.

of singular use to compare a word or a sentence with the context, or to compare one law with other laws that are made by the same legislator⁴." Take the ordinary case of the construction of a will. Is not the primary document, by which we seek to determine the meaning of any particular bequest, the very will itself? Is it lawful to resort to any other document whatsoever for that purpose, until the will itself fail in supplying us with the required information? We fearlessly answer, No. So here: the question is—Does our Church leave a given doctrine an open one, or not? The Offices for Infant Baptism contain that doctrine⁵. Those Offices are complete, independent, substantive Services: they have as much claim to be dealt with as such, as the will has. They no more lose their individuality of character, because they have been incorporated into, and form part of, the entire Book of Common Prayer—than does each several Act of Parliament, because passed in the same Session, and bound up in one and the same volume, as other Statutes. And yet our Judges bid us look "dehors" those Services, (as the lawyers say,) and that, not to explain ambiguities in them—for there have been none alleged to exist—and if they did, who knows but that they might be reconciled by the context? And thus difficulties are imported into the Services, which did not appertain to them, by a comparison of them with other documents constructed under different circumstances, with different objects in view, and at different periods of time. Each several Service of our Church was impressed with a particular signification of its own, when it issued from the hands of its framers. That signification followed it through its various vicissitudes; and as long as it survives to speak the language of the Church *at all, so long it speaks it as it ever has spoken it.*

"Oh! but," it is said, "the question before the Court is an Article of Faith; and Articles of Faith are not to be looked for in forms of devotion; and the Baptismal Services are forms of devotion. They are, therefore, not the proper field to resort to for the settlement of a doctrinal point." But is the case really so? Are they forms of devotion *merely*? Not to mention here the Rubrics attached to them, (which are essentially connected with both doctrine and discipline,) the Exhortations which occur in them contain, as clearly as words can, instructions by the Priest as to what the People should *believe* and *do*. The sponsors, too, are specifically interrogated as to their belief in "all the Articles of the Christian Faith." It might as well be contended, therefore, that the opening Exhortation in the Order for Morning Prayer does not express the Church's mind upon the importance of

⁴ 1 Blackst. Comm.

⁵ 57 Canon. [1603 A.D.]

Public Worship; or that the Creeds themselves are not Summaries of Faith; as that the Baptismal Services do not contain her *doctrines* of Baptism, as well as her *devotions*.

Do we yet hesitate? The 57th Canon of our Church, which became a Law of the Church in 1603, *and is so still*, is decisive upon the point: "The doctrine both of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used at the administration of the said Sacraments, as nothing can be added to it that is material or necessary." Why then did the Judges resort to the Thirty-nine Articles for an exponent of that doctrine? It is true, as Mr. Goode points out, that the above quotation is a portion only of the Canon, which had special reference to the refusal by the people of the Sacraments at the hands of unpreaching ministers. But we cannot see that the generality of the declaration is thereby restricted. May not an universal truth be enunciated in a resolution framed primarily to meet a particular case? Mr. Goode interprets it to mean, that "all which it is material and necessary to bring before the people when administering Baptism as to the nature of the rite, is contained in the appointed service⁶." *And so do we.* And we go on to engraft upon that interpretation this conclusion—that since "the nature of the rite" is therein "sufficiently set forth," we do not require, nay, it is against the plain rules of Law "applicable to the construction of all written instruments," (the Judge's own words,) to require, any other description, teaching, or evidence whatsoever, respecting it. Mr. Goode imputes to the Bishop of Exeter that he "wrested" the above quotation from its context, "concealed the true nature" [of the Canon,] and "managed to get" [only] "an appearance of an argument out of it⁷." Is it, then, "perversion" to quote only so much of an authority as is, or seems to be, material to prove one's case? Is it "concealment," not to fill one's pages with a description of all the surrounding circumstances of a passage, which was only referred to *at all* as containing the enunciation of a general truth? Is an authoritative declaration, that the doctrine of the Church on Baptism is sufficiently set down in her Baptismal Services, an "apparent," and not rather a most clenching and irresistible, argument?

Granting however, for the sake of argument, that the Judges were correct in referring to the Thirty-nine Articles in the first instance, to ascertain the Church's mind on Baptism,—see how they fail us!—fail us, in that they leave unsettled the very questions we consulted them on, namely, the meaning of a "worthy reception" of Baptism, and of the direction that "the Baptism of

⁶ Letter, p. 75.

⁷ Ibid. p. 74.

young children is any wise to be retained as most agreeable to the institution of Christ." See how they refer us, necessarily, back again to some other document for the elucidation of these points. . And that document what other can it be, but those very Baptismal Services, which *we* contend should have been the first to be examined, but which *the Judges*, with one eminent exception, willingly and "intentionally" disregarded. We have as clear, categorical, ay as doctrinal a statement in the appointed Services, as the "wit of man could have devised:" we are forbidden to expound the Church's mind from that statement, and are referred, in lieu of it, to certain heads of doctrine, which treating *summarily* of Nine and Thirty distinct subject matters, it was obvious to see must necessarily be deficient in a *detailed* treatment of any one; and, to complete the Anomaly, we are compelled, by the very imperfections of the standard of appeal, to retrace our steps, for a final clue in the matter, to the original formulary which we had pronounced an incompetent guide. Who ever heard of the history of a whole nation being ransacked for the details of a single statesman's life, in preference to his own biography? Who ever heard of an Act of Parliament being construed by the marginal summary of its sections; of the less circumstantial being admitted, when the more circumstantial was within reach; or of the abstract of a man's title being resorted to, instead of the title-deeds themselves? Yet this would be hardly more preposterous than the Law of Evidence which the Judicial Committee has sanctioned in the threshold of their enquiry.

Whether therefore first or last, mediately or immediately, it is to the Church's Services of Baptism that we must go for a consideration of her doctrine therein. Show us that any thing contained in them is at variance with any other of her doctrines contained in any other portion of the Book of Common Prayer; show us even that there lurk in them any ambiguities, or equivocal, or intricate, reasoning, which of necessity require us to call in the assistance of extrinsic evidence for their interpretation—and we will at once abandon our position, and admit that the argument must be conducted on a different footing, *but till then* we assert the right to have it conducted on that footing, and on no other, just as is done every day of our lives, and with universal approbation, in Westminster Hall, in the interpretation of agreements, deeds, wills, and all other written instruments whatsoever.

In the spirit then of candid but reverent enquirers, let us now approach those Services. Should we seem to linger too long upon them, let us reflect that the legality or illegality of the recent Judgment *depends upon their construction*, and that it is impos-

sible to exaggerate the necessity of a close inspection of their frame and context. If it were the question of the meaning of a deed, should we not examine carefully its details? Were we judging of the intentions of a testator, should we not scrutinize narrowly the will? And we are to proceed, say the Judges, in this, as in any other case. And here it is essential to ascertain the Church's meaning of the word "Regeneration." Eminent writers have been called in to establish and describe the distinction between it and Renovation. To us it seems unnecessary to enter into that distinction at all. The Church uses the word "Regeneration." It becomes incumbent therefore on us to ascertain what she understands by it. But to go into distinctions between it and something else, seems as foreign to the purpose in hand as it would be, when asked to define an acid, to propound a disquisition on an alkali. What is "Regeneration?" The Church herself supplies us with the answer. In the Offices we are considering she calls it "spiritual Regeneration." She prays too that water may be "sanctified," and when the child is sprinkled with it, she *forthwith* pronounces him "regenerate." Now water itself can't be made holy, except so far as it is the instrument of making the child so. Again,—not to mention that text (Tit. iii. 5) which Mr. Goode is so displeased with the Bishop for "perverting," (but his "perversion" of which is no more "proven," than was his "wresting," and "concealment," of the 57th Canon, inasmuch as the words of the original, grammatically considered,⁸ support the Bishop's view of them, just as much, *to say the least*, as Mr. Goode's)—Eph. v. 26 is strong to show, that "Sanctification" is the "Regeneration" given by Baptism; and to this agree the words of Hooker, "to our sanctification here [Baptism is] a step that hath not any before it"⁹. Yet Mr. Goode no where notices this important result of the Sacrament, and in his silence of them *as cause and effect*, lies the fallacy in his reasoning throughout. He speaks of Regeneration, but not as a spiritual operation. He treats of it indeed as that whereby the baptized becomes a "child of God," and a "member of Christ," [Letter, p. 78,] but only in a formal sense, as a grant "formally made over by Baptism" [ib. p. 63]. He compares it again and again to the act of admittance to a human society. Occasionally he *does* even speak of it as "spiritual Regeneration."

⁸ Letter, p. 12.

⁹ Whether the word ἀνακαινώσεως is governed by λουτροῦ, or by διὰ (understood), is surely a matter of opinion equally with the question, whether the phrase "washing of regeneration" refers to Baptism at all. How then can that be called, in fairness, the "manufacturing of a statement," [see Letter, p. 12,] which is a rendering that the context legitimately, though not solely, admits of?

¹⁰ Eccl. Pol. v. 60.

But then the context immediately discloses that he had in view a change only of the state, and not of the heart. Nay he expressly calls the grace of the Sacrament the “regenerate *state* !” Throughout, he studiously avoids committing himself to the assertion that it has any necessary connexion with inward Sanctification.

Nor is it immaterial to observe the mind of those who framed the first Liturgy of Edward VI. If much that was part of it was altered by the Liturgy of 1552, and has ceased to be the Law of the Church, much also has been left *unaltered*; and amongst the portions left *unaltered*, are the declarations, *still in use*, of the infants’ “Spiritual Regeneration.” That which was the meaning of the Reformers in 1549, as to that phrase, is the meaning of our Prayer Book now. To use the words of Archbishop Bancroft’s chaplain, cited by Sir H. J. Fust, though for a different purpose, “the words be the same, and none other, than erst and first they were, and therefore the sense the same, the doctrines the same, and the purpose and intention of our Church still one and the same.” What that sense was then, and that Sanctification was contemplated by the Church as often as she spoke of “Regeneration,” is evident, from the repealed portions of the Liturgy of 1549; to which we have at least as much right to refer as our opponents have to search for the sense of the rubric of 1560 in that of a repealed one of 1536. Take, for example, the prayer of Exorcism before Baptism, and that striking act of putting the chrisom or white vest on the child after Baptism, with these words, “Take this white vesture for a token of the innocency which, by God’s grace, *in this sacrament of Baptism is given* unto thee.” What she meant by “Regeneration” *then*, she means *now*, for she still uses the word. Else, too, why was the Pentecostal anniversary for many ages of the Church one of the only two permitted festivals of the year for the administration of Baptism¹¹? Else, too, what is the meaning and use of the prayers, immediately before the Priest names the child, “that the new man may be raised up in him;” “that all carnal affections may die in him;” “that he may triumph against the devil, the world, and the flesh;” “and that he may be endued with heavenly virtues?”—*prayers evidently fulfilled*, (according to the Church,) *immediately after water is poured on the child, because thanks are then returned for their fulfilment, and the language of supplication is exchanged for that of praise.*

Consider, finally, the language of the Church Catechism. Take,

¹¹ Wheatly on Common Prayer.

for instance, the Question, "What is the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism?" What says the Answer? "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." What is this but to say, in so many words, "We are sanctified by Baptism?" But Faith and Repentance (the Catechism goes on to say) are required of persons to be baptized, and these shall be dispensed with, at least as to their present *performance*, in the case of infants, and a present *promise* of them, instead, shall be sufficient. Well, then, children who neither believe nor repent, but "promise both by their sureties," receive Baptism in the same way, that is, with the same benefits, as they who can and do both believe and repent. The inference is irresistible:—*The conclusion that all infants are infallibly regenerate by Baptism, is a logical and inevitable deduction from the Church's position respecting adults.* She cannot, without self-contradiction, lay down her rule of Faith as she does, with regard to the latter, and deny the invariable right reception of Baptism to the former.

Leaving the Catechism, however, the ingenuity of our objectors leaps to the Baptismal Service for Adults, and takes a different line of argument. "The Church," say they, "declares of adults, equally as of infants, that they 'are Regenerate by God's Holy Spirit.' The Regeneration, however, of adults is, you admit, contingent on their faith and repentance, and so must it be with infants, for the Church cannot be held to have used the word in the two Services in different senses. If the words are not to be taken in the *opus operatum* sense in both, they cannot in either." But to this objection there is an obvious answer. How can the later document be cited as affixing a meaning to the earlier, which was in use, and must have had an ascertained sense of its own, one hundred years before? Your argument, we reply, *might indeed be used the other way*: it might be contended that a dogmatic and unconditional sense is given to the term "Regeneration" in the Baptism of Adults, because it occurs in the Service for Infants; but it is impossible that the sense of the latter (whatever it was) was narrowed, or amplified, or, in fact, in any way affected, by the introduction of the same word into a subsequent Office applicable to a different class of recipients.

But to return: The Priest begins by beseeching the people to call on God, "to grant to this child" [at what time, save at Baptism?] "that thing which by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost." Here, then, is a presently future gift, and a presently future accomplishment, in

view. And, after being reminded that Baptism was prefigured by the water which saved Noah¹², and the children of Israel, and was further sanctified by our Saviour in Jordan, the congregation prays God, to “wash and sanctify the child with the Holy Ghost, and that he may receive remission of sins by spiritual regeneration; and that God will receive him, as he has promised, that he may enjoy the everlasting benediction of His Heavenly washing.”

A yet clearer intimation of the Church’s mind is next derived from the well-known passage from St. Mark: “Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no-wise enter therein. And He took them up in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them.” She propounds the example of little children to all Christian men for their imitation. Were this the only passage in the whole Service which bore upon the point we are considering, it would be sufficient to prove that the inseparability of Grace from the Sacrament must have been present to the framers of it; for, as the pious Bishop Taylor excellently well observes, “If all men, according to Christ’s saying, must receive the kingdom of God as little children, *it is certain* little children do receive it; *they receive it as men ought*; that is, without any impediment or obstruction, without any thing that is contrary to that state¹³.” Now this reception of the kingdom of God must mean something more than a mere passive or formal admission to Gospel Privileges; otherwise no peculiar frame of mind would be enjoined. We should like to know how Messrs. Gorham and Goode get over this passage.

The Church next tells her people “to doubt not, but earnestly believe”—“to be persuaded”—“that our Saviour will receive and embrace the Infant, give him eternal life, and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom:” nay, so persuaded is she of all this, that she proceeds to thank Him for it; and further exhorting the sponsors, declares, that His promise to give all these things “He, for His part, WILL MOST SURELY keep and perform;” praying, withal, that the child “now to be baptized may receive” [when—if not now? by what—if not by Baptism?] “the fulness of God’s grace.” Can words be stronger? Can the precise time spoken of be more clearly pointed out? Is this the

¹² It would be well if the full force of the passage, “who didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water,” were more generally given by the Reader. The words “by water” depend grammatically on the word “save,” and not on the word “perishing.” Water was the cause of death to the world, but of salvation to Noah. Hence the ambiguity. A transposition of the words “by water” to their proper place, or a correct punctuation, would mark the sense.

¹³ Works, vol. ii. p. 265.

language of hypothesis? Is it possible that the Most High should condescend to promise and to bless—and the Church appropriate to herself that condescension—and yet no blessing be left behind?—no fulfilment crown the promise? When on the green grass, among five thousand—when at the Last Supper—when at Emmaus—He blessed bread, did no inevitable efficacy attach to it from the benediction? Does the water of Baptism, which is blessed, remain thenceforth unsanctified? This we cannot hold. This did not the Reformers hold—Calvinists howsoever they were—when, in 1549, they caused the Priest, anointing the infant after Baptism to say, in the spirit of Apostolical authority, “Almighty God, who *hath* regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and *hath* given unto thee remission of all thy sins; He vouchsafe to anoint thee with the unction of His Holy Spirit¹⁴.” For we must never forget, that what is left us of our mutilated Baptismal Services for Infants was the creation of those very Reformers; many of whose usages and much of whose discipline our Church still upholds for Law; for “all ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their ministration, are to be retained and be in use, as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament” [observe, not in the fifth, but—] “in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth¹⁵.” A pretty plain proof, one would have thought, that the *animus* of those Reformers, notwithstanding the ordeals through which the discipline and doctrine of our Church has passed, has never been finally superseded or abandoned.

Hitherto the Church has assumed the attitude of an humble suppliant, faithfully expecting, but without having received, an answer to her petitions. But mark! The water is poured, the name is named, the solemn words are said—thenceforth she takes up the strain of joyous and exalting praise: “Let us give thanks,” &c. “We yield Thee hearty thanks, that it hath pleased Thee to Regenerate this Infant with thy Holy Spirit:” and then she proceeds to prayer—that he “being dead” [that is, having been just made, by baptism, dead] “unto sin,” according to the promises before recited, (and of which the Church had “doubted not” the fulfilment) that he should be “released from his sins,” may “partake of Christ’s resurrection.”

But as though to put all doubt aside, and to condense the Church’s belief in a summary as purely doctrinal as any of the Thirty-nine Articles themselves, a Rubric immediately follows in these words, “It is certain, by God’s word, that children, which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly

¹⁴ See the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

¹⁵ See the beginning of the Order for Morning Prayer.

saved." One would have hoped that at least this proposition was categorical enough to have avoided all disputation, and satisfied a Bench of Law-Lords. But no. It is of it, that Lord Langdale declares, speaking the judgment of his Colleagues, that "it does not say such children are saved by baptism." (!) With reason indeed was it that the Bishop of Exeter wrote that he "could not argue such a matter." Nearly may we pardon even a Bishop's undissembled irony and "bitterness." Let us examine how far Lord Langdale was justified in such a declaration. Now we suppose that even in these our days of ingenious verbalities, and critical fastidiousness, words with less ambiguity *on the face of them*,—more strong to express what they signify according to their "true, plain, and literal" meaning, and less conditional or hypothetical, could not possibly have been chosen. But the difficulty which the Judges found, arose here also from their construing them by the side of another document, viz., the Rubric of 1536. To adopt such a mode of construction was subversive of the plainest rules of Law. Compare each part of the same Formulary together, to collect the meaning of the whole, or to explain the meaning of any part, unquestionably they might; but to travel to a repealed Rubric, which for the purposes of the discussion ought to have been regarded as no longer, *and was in fact no longer*, *in esse*, to ascertain the effect of an existing one, is like interpreting a statute of Queen Victoria by an expired one of George III. According then to the Judges and to Mr. Goode, the sentence must be read as if there were another qualification, besides baptism, annexed as a condition to the infant's salvation—which there is not—and it will then run thus: "It is certain by God's word that infants which are baptized, [and which have received a *prævenient* grace], dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." But if this second qualification may be appended, why may not a third; and if a third, why not a fourth? and where will be the arithmetical limit of such introductions of new matter?

It is difficult to calculate, it is alarming to contemplate, it is impossible to over-estimate, the danger of the precedent which the Judges have here laid down; it amounts to this, and nothing short of this, that let a sentence or clause of any written instrument whatsoever, no matter how solemn or important, be never so precisely, technically, guardedly worded by its author, it shall not be unlawful for any chance reader of it, nay, for any judicial expounder of it, to qualify, alter, narrow, or enlarge the same, by virtue of other words transported into it according to his own private judgment; so that at last it will come to pass, that nothing will ever be allowed to mean what

it does really mean ; no safeguard will exist in a man's title-deeds—no certainty in the Gospels—no criteria in grammar, and no tests in logic ! According to the selfsame argument of the Judges, even the awful teaching of the Church upon the doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth in the Athanasian Creed, is not, or perchance may not, be explicit or dogmatic. “This is the Catholic Faith which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved,” “Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith,” have no more reason to be accounted the positive teaching of the Church, than has the Rubric before us. Nay, Mr. Goode's own favourite oath of Supremacy as administered in the Ordination Service will, when tried by this rule, be found to dwindle into the mere shadow of an obligation. The solemnity of all authoritative declarations consists in their positiveness. The terrors of the Decalogue lie in this. Strip them of it, and invest them with an hypothetical character, and you lay the first stone of heresy, and are rearing an altar to misbelief. It is no answer to say there is a difference between the doctrines of the Trinity and of Baptism, and that they are not equally fundamental ; for how are we to know which doctrines the Church holds as fundamental, and which not, *except by her language* ? We must judge of the value she attaches to any subject-matter by the phraseology which she employs with respect to it. We have no right to hazard fanciful conjectures as to her meaning ; still less to interpolate words which she never sanctioned.

But now let us grant, for a moment, that the Judges *were* justified in expounding the Rubric of 1560 by that of 1536. *Do the two essentially differ* ? Have they rightly interpreted the former when they deny that it attributes, in terms, as much as the other, the salvation of infants to Baptism. Let us apply the terms of the Rubric, *mutatis mutandis*, to a familiar instance or two from daily life. “It is certain,” we say, “that children which are good will be happy ?” Is this not equivalent to a predication of goodness *as the cause* of their happiness ? or suppose a person to affirm, (no matter here what the truth of the affirmation be,) that “it is certain that children which have been vaccinated will be safe from the small-pox ;” or that “ships which do not keep a good look out on a dangerous coast will be undoubtedly lost.” The small-pox rages in a village, and carries off hundreds : the vaccinated children escape. Or a vessel is wrecked on the coast in question. Will not the salvation of the children, and the loss of the ship, be connected in the mind of the affirmant with the observance or neglect of the conditions which he attached to his assertions, *as cause and effect* ? To our unsophisticated understandings it is all one and the same thing to assert of children

“that those which are baptized will be saved,” as to say “that those receiving baptism are saved thereby.” The word “thereby” is mere surplusage.

We shall not dwell long, and that for the reason we are about to assign, on the question on which so much argument has been expended, what weight is due to the private opinions of the Reformers of the Church’s Services. We confess we have never understood how, after passing in full review before them the writings of Jewell, Usher, Hooker, Taylor, Whitgift, Carleton, and Prideaux, the Judicial Committee could say that “they did not affirm their doctrines and opinions could be received as evidence of the doctrine of the Church of England.” So, too, indeed, should we have said. But then the question leaps to our lips—Why quote those opinions at all? Why waste words on them? Why encumber the already encumbered question with them? They go for nothing, or next to nothing. They advance the controversy not a jot, according to the Judges’ own admission, and yet we cannot help fearing that they have unconsciously gone for more than they ought. When once a document is inspected, which, according to the strict rules of evidence, ought not to be inspected, can we be sure our minds remain unaffected by the notice which it conveys?

Yet, stranger still—these very Judges who cite so willingly individual opinions, notwithstanding that they declare them “not receivable as evidence,” have not attached the smallest weight, nay, have passed by altogether unnoticed, the clear and unanimous opinion of twelve contemporary Bishops, and eight contemporary Doctors of Divinity, who all declared their sentiments on this “open” question *just the other way!* Mr. Goode labours hard to prove that no value is due to those sentiments, as authoritative statements; but he can never disentitle them to at least as much deference, as he is anxious to procure for the citations from the Divines most favourable to his views. The Judges had no right to allow to Mr. Gorham the opinions of Hooker, Taylor, and the rest, and withhold from the Bishop those of the Divines, who were, most of them, members of that celebrated Convocation, from whose deliberations we have received our Prayer Book in its present shape. Moreover, the former class of authorities are, at the most, doubtful ones. For one passage which makes *for* Mr. Gorham, it is not difficult to produce from the same author another which tells *against* him. One unequivocal, as we had thought, and decided testimony is, a few pages further on, neutralized by others, which leave us in the dark what the real result of the writer’s opinions was. Whereas the precise pinch of the Gorham controversy was presented pointedly to the notice of the Savoy Commissioners, and

by them as pointedly answered. But if individual opinions are to be called in aid at all, as it can hardly be doubted they have been to an undue degree, notwithstanding Lord Langdale's disclaimer, why are those of living Churchmen entitled to no consideration; why, for example, should we disregard the fervid eloquence of a Wilberforce, the clear commanding logic of a Manning, the profound erudition of a Pusey, or the searching spiritual melodies of a Keble; leaders of a school as superior to the Evangelical in its depths of knowledge, as (to say the least) it is its equal in piety? Are living authors not to be cited on points of law? Does "Williams on Executors" cease to be an authority, because its eminent author still survives to adorn the Bench?

The truth, however, seems to be, that the Church's doctrine on any particular question is to be learned, like any thing else, firstly, by an inspection and examination of those of her authorized Services, which relate exclusively to the controverted point; if ambiguity be discoverable therein, then, secondarily, by a comparison therewith of her other authorized Formularies; and that the private writings of Divines are valueless as criteria of her doctrine, unless, as was the case with the Savoy Commissioners, they concurred in any synodical compilation of her code; and then only to the extent of that concurrence.

Having dismissed the authority of individual opinions for one purpose, we shall not be expected to attach more weight to them when cited, as they have been, for another, to support the doctrine of "charitable presumptions." The Church, it is said, "presumes charitably" of infants, that they are worthy recipients of Baptism, and to substantiate that, several of the same Divines are referred to. This, we begin with saying, is fairly giving up the point. We had thought the argument had been throughout, that the Church *had laid down no doctrine* one way or the other, but had left it an "open" question to believe or not to believe, as each person chose. Now we are all at once told, that she *does* admit the doctrine, only, that she "presumes" it "charitably." If she presumes it, then she holds it. Presumption is belief. It *may* be strong belief. Nor need it be less a doctrine of the Church because it is a charitable one. Is it inconsistent with her dogmatic teaching that her dogmas should be based on that Charity, "which, believing all things," includes, and is "greater" than, Faith? She calls her "work," for instance, of bringing infants to Baptism, a "charitable" one¹⁶. Does she thereby intend to surrender one tittle of her conviction that that work is one of imperative duty also, enjoined to her by her great Head, and in no wise optional in her to disobey?

¹⁶ See the Office for Infant Public Baptism.

And lastly, we are referred to the Burial Service. Because the Church uses the language of hope there, she does so here. Now this argument cannot hold good, unless those who advance it show further that the Church views the Burial of her dead as a rite equally important with the Baptism of her children. But the Burial of the dead is no Sacrament. She would violate no command, "ordained of Christ Himself," were she to refuse that rite. It would be reasonable therefore, *à priori*, to expect that in a ceremony which she only observes in charity, the language of charity only should find place. But that language can never be adduced to interpret another service framed *alio intuitu*, and for a much more solemn occasion. Must the Church have had one and the same view in all the matters included in the Book of Common Prayer? The parts of it are distinct, though united; and accordingly we find Dissenters agreeing with her in some, and parting company with her in others. *In one she may breathe the language of Hope, because she Hopes; in another the language of Belief, because she Believes. The question is, what is her language in each?*

And now to apply ourselves for a few moments, before we conclude, to the two principal letters which head our article. Mr. Goode has, we must say, been as unsuccessful in the legitimate stand-up warfare of logic with the Bishop, as he has been in that strategy of vituperation, which will, we fear, blemish indelibly his repute in the eyes of all those whose opinion is worth the having. Throughout full five-and-twenty pages of his letter he twits the Bishop for "intimating, that though he [the Bishop] had been the Primate's friend for nearly thirty years, he had been compelled to become now only his Grace's afflicted servant¹⁷." Did ever such an intimation fall from the Bishop? He had subscribed himself his "Grace's affectionate friend for nearly thirty years, *and* now afflicted servant;" but it is certainly the first time in our lives, that we have heard of the copulative "AND" being interpreted as the antithetical "BUT." There are legal cases, we believe, which have gone so far as to construe it synonymously with "or," but we stake our reputation on the assertion that it has no where been held to totally reverse the sense of a passage, as Mr. Goode would have it do. So he must not be surprised, if, when writing, in sorrow, to an old college friend, he shall sign himself his affectionate and now afflicted friend, his correspondent shall take it for granted that affliction has annihilated his affection, and that he has ceased to be his friend at all, because he has become a sorrowing one too. Truly,

¹⁷ Mr. Goode's Letter, p. 3.

we have rather a pregnant hint, at the outset, how far Mr. Goode is capable to conduct a controversy, or construe aright a written instrument !

With the same inattention to facts, Mr. Goode charges his superior with accusing the Archbishop that his change of views was a "recent one"¹⁸ ; although the Bishop had expressly stated, when complaining of the change, that those "lower views" had been "adopted" by the Archbishop "for some years"¹⁹. Nor is he more happy in reminding the Bishop that he "stood aghast at hearing such teaching from such a place fifteen years too late ; all this teaching, just concocted at Lambeth, having been before the world all that time"²⁰. Yes ; but not before the world FROM LAMBETH fifteen years ; no, nor yet one ; which was the gist of the Bishop's lament. It was the teaching *from Lambeth* at which he "stood aghast."

Again ; the Bishop had objected to the Archbishop's wish for more faith in the parents of the baptized, that it made "the first moving of God towards them contingent on the will of man." This objection Mr. Goode hurls back at the Bishop, rejoining, that nothing could make that "first moving" more contingent than the Bishop's own view ; according to which, parents have it in their power, by bringing or not bringing the children, to "regulate the time when that moving shall take place"²¹. But the same objection, if a good one, would apply to the other Sacrament. Priests, it might as well be said, have the power to keep back the Eucharist from the people, by refusing to celebrate it. The minister who only four times or thrice a year invites his flock to the Lord's table, defeats, according to Mr. Goode, the grace of that Sacrament. And yet we apprehend that he would not very severely censure those who do not give the people the most frequent opportunities possible of Communicating ! The fact, however, is, that the analogy instituted by Mr. Goode does not, strictly, hold good. According to the Bishop, "it is *not* entirely in the parents' power to prevent God's grace towards the child," any further, or in any other sense, than this, that the parent has the power of not bringing the child at all, *but when once brought, he cannot hinder the grace* ; whereas the Bishop's complaint of the Archbishop's view is, that the parent *may* frustrate that grace, *after the very rite* itself is performed, and thereby the ordinance of God be invalidated by the will of man. The one does not derogate from the efficacy of the Sacrament, *as a Sacrament* : the other obviously does.

Similarly, too, does Mr. Goode fail²² in shaking the Bishop's

¹⁸ Mr. Goode's Letter, p. 4.

²⁰ Mr. Goode's Letter, pp. 6, 7.

²² Mr. Goode's Letter, p. 15.

¹⁹ Bp. of Exeter's Letter, p. 4.

²¹ Mr. Goode's Letter, p. 8.

assertion, that there is in Scripture no intimation of our Saviour's approval of the zeal of the Jewish parents, who brought their children to Him. When our Lord blamed those [that is, the disciples] that would have kept them [that is, the children] from Him, what allusion is made to the parents?

The Bishop and Mr. Goode are at issue about the African Code. It is true that Johnson does, in the passage referred to by the latter, refuse it a place in the Code of the Universal Church. But was he correct in excluding it? That is the question. It is to the Canon of the Council of Chalcedon that we must go, which runs thus: "We pronounce it to be fit and just that the Canons of the Holy Fathers, made in every Synod to this present time"²³, be in full force." Johnson's note on it is this²⁴: "By these words we are to understand only the Canons that have been already presented to the reader," [the African Code not being among that number,] "beginning with those of Nice, and which composed that Book of Canons so often cited in this Synod, as is agreed on all hands." Now, the African Code was settled by a great number of Bishops met in Synod at Carthage, more than thirty years before the Council of Chalcedon. Were not African Bishops Holy Fathers? Were not African Councils Synods? Why, then, is not that Code within the purview of the first Canon of Chalcedon? In truth it is not very clear what Johnson himself held to be the Code of the Universal Church, for in another passage²⁵ he states that the African Code *was* part of it. Thus after saying at the end of the 29th Canon of Chalcedon, "Here ends the Code of the Universal Church," he immediately adds, "'Tis true, if we take the Synod of Trullo for a General Council, AS IT REALLY WAS, AS MUCH AS ANY SYNOD WHATSOEVER, then all the Canons contained in this volume" (the African code being of the number), "are part of that code, except the Papal decrees." He goes on indeed to say, that for several centuries, Rome had disallowed Trullo to be a General Council; but how can that neutralize the previous declaration of his own opinion? And if the Trullan were a General Council, the African was part of the Universal Code; for the 2nd Trullan Canon [A.D. 698] "confirmed all previous Canons of Councils and Fathers"²⁶. But be it so, that the African Code *was not* entitled so to rank. Mr. Goode ought at least to have told his readers, what Johnson says *in its praise*²⁷. "It was always in the greatest repute in all Churches, next after that [the Universal] Code; it was of very great authority in the Old English Churches, for many of the

²³ i. e. A.D. 451.

²⁵ Part ii. p. 139.

²⁷ Clergyman's Vade-mecum, Part ii. p. 171.

²⁴ Clergyman's Vade-mecum, Part ii. p. 139.

²⁶ See the First Canon of the Trullan Council.

Excerptions of Egbert were transcribed from it." And what does its 110th Canon say, "He that denies original sin, or that infants are baptized for the remission of sins, be anathema." A stronger authority, if possible, in favour of the Bishop's views, than the 1st Canon of the 4th Council of Carthage would have been, if it had been an undisputed Canon of the Church.

The Archbishop in the body of his book on Apostolical Preaching, states it to be of "the positive doctrine of the Church, that renewal belongs to all who are baptized in the name of Christ:" in his new preface to that book he allows "that a Minister of that Church may justly maintain that the benefit of Baptism is limited to those cases only where an antecedent grace has taken place." Mr. Goode attempts no defence of this extraordinary contradiction between preface and context, further than by drawing off the reader's attention from it, by the *ad hominem* argument²⁸, that the Bishop had no right to challenge the Archbishop with it. Why not? Not because he had previously *approved* of his Grace's position—that would have been a good argument; but because, forsooth, he had previously quoted, *with disapproval*, passages of the same tendency as those he was then condemning!

We trust that his Grace will give or authorize to be given some explanation of the astounding phenomenon that in the self-same year in which he gives forth to the world his opinion, *as an author*, that a given doctrine is the positive doctrine of the Church, he, *sitting as an assessor to a Court of Justice*, declares that it is *not* the positive doctrine of the Church!!

Then after four pages of personal invective, rendered doubly disagreeable to our ears by the zealous professions of regard for spiritual subordination which accompany it, and after several pages on adult baptism, which have nothing to do with the question, Mr. Goode accuses the Bishop of inconsistency²⁹, because in one place he had said that "all infants receive remission of their sins by Baptism because of their innocence;" and in another, that the "guilt of original sin rested upon them until washed away in Baptism." Was Mr. Goode unable to perceive that when the Bishop mentioned infants as fit objects by reason of their innocence, he *of course* meant "innocency" from "actual" sin. May they not be guilty as to original, and yet innocent as to committed, sin?

The next charge is one³⁰ of ludicrous inconsistency, "in overstating the efficacy of Baptism in infants, and making it a nullity in the case of unbelieving adults." Because the Bishop had said that spiritual Regeneration was *the* effect of Baptism," ergo (Mr.

²⁸ Mr. Goode's Letter, p. 17.

²⁹ Ibid. p. 30.

³⁰ Ibid. p. 30.

Goode jumps to the conclusion) "if this is not given," in the opinion of the Bishop, "nothing is given." When we say, then, that "the effect" of inaccurate reasoning is to draw off men's minds from the truth, we are to be understood, according to the Rector of Allhallows, as limiting its ill effects to that one particular. Will he pardon us for asking him whether he himself could not suggest this other, that it damages the reputation of the inaccurate thinker? *Of course* the Bishop attributes to Baptism all its minor advantages, including, among them, the "sealing and confirming to us of the Gospel Covenant;" only he takes leave to add to them another and a greater one, which forms no part of Mr. Goode's Creed, and which he designates "the effect" of Baptism, because it is the *primary and principal one*.

Mr. Goode now passes in review those passages from our early Divines, which have been the subject of so much comment; but to which, as we have said, we ourselves attach very little importance in determining the present controversy. He may make what inference he chooses from them, (we cannot see how it will avail him, in this particular case,) *provided always that he does not misrepresent them*. For instance, we demur to his construction of the well-known passage from Bp. Taylor, cited at length in pp. 42, 43, of his "Letter;" two lines only of which, however, touch upon Infant Baptism. They are these: "In Infants it is not certain but that some [grace] is collated or infused; however, be it so or no, yet upon this account the administration of the Sacrament is not hindered." Is it possible, subjoins Mr. Goode, that words can be used more completely justifying Mr. Gorham's view? Now, we protest, that if the words above quoted are evidence one way or the other, they are rather a weak intimation of Bishop Taylor's opinion *against* Mr. Gorham than *in his favour*. "It is not certain, but," is, we take it, a qualified affirmative equivalent to "perhaps." At least, and viewed as favourably as possible to Mr. Goode's construction, (who lays stress on the phrase "be it so or no,") they leave the matter in pure uncertainty, and are tantamount to a declaration, that the point is an obscure one, upon which the Bishop does not like to hazard an explicit opinion one way or the other. He is like a witness who, when put into the witness-box, knows nothing at all about the *res gestæ* of the action³¹.

³¹ As a set-off to the above passage, even if we allow that it justifies Mr. Gorham's view, should be appended the following from the same eminent divine: "Since God hath given the Holy Spirit to them that are baptized, and rightly confirmed, and entered into covenant with Him, our bodies are made temples of the Holy Ghost, in which He dwells. It is St. Paul's argument, 'Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?' and, 'He that defiles a temple, him will God destroy.'" Holy Living, p. 86. The bodies even of the unclean are holy Temples because of their Baptism, according to Bp. Taylor.

We next come to the Decades of Bullinger. Bullinger, it appears, wrote a volume containing fifty sermons; but of these four only treated of the Sacraments. From these four the Archbishop had culled certain passages, of which the Bishop thinks, that taken in their "real meaning, they contradict the very Articles and Formularies." In the main, however, he thinks the volume may have been an "useful manual." Out of this very plain and intelligible statement, however, Mr. Goode finds material for accusing the Bishop once more of self-contradiction. "Your endeavour to get over the fact of such a volume being set forth for the better exercise of learning in the inferior Clergy, merely because it was considered, in the main, an useful manual, though, in some most essential points, its statements contradict the very Articles and Formularies of our Church, I leave to the reader's reflection³²." According, then, to Mr. Goode's logic, to say of a book, that a twelfth part of it contains objectionable matter, is as much as to say, that the remaining eleven-twelfths must contain objectionable matter likewise!

Again; after ridiculing the notion that any "order" in 1586, "ordering the Orders for the Discipline of the Church" to be observed, should be expected, Mr. Goode all at once stumbles upon such an order³³. But unluckily this order, the existence of which vindicates the reasonableness of the Bishop's expectation, does not help the finder. The Bishop had doubted whether Bullinger's Decades had ever been authoritatively taught, on the ground, (though not "the" only ground) that no order, as far as he could find, was ever made *by the Upper House* of Convocation. To confute this, Mr. Goode produces an order made—by whom? not by the Upper House—that would have been *ad rem*—but *by the Lower*!

Again; the Bishop had said that no Canon or Act relating to Bullinger's book appeared in *the Acts of the Convocation* of 1586. Mr. Goode, whilst thinking to disprove this statement, unconsciously and remarkably confirms it, by quoting from Strype a circular letter of Archbishop Whitgift, in which he says, with reference to the "orders" in question, that "though it had seemed fit to himself and his brethren to put them in execution, such resolution *had not the effect of a Judicial Act*, or conclusion by the authority of Convocation³⁴." Just what, and all that, the Bishop had asserted! It is a rash thing to measure the sword of debate with so close and correct a reasoner as Dr. Philpotts.

Then, once more, Mr. Goode declares the Bishop has "with

³² Letter, p. 47.

³³ Ibid. p. 48.

³⁴ Letter, pp. 50, 51. Strype's Whitgift, book iii. c. 20.

his own hands torn up his doctrine from the very roots, and made a most awkward slip²⁵, because he could not imagine the Sacrament administered healthfully without God's grace and favour. This he considers an admission, that all infants *come to Baptism with grace*, and therefore must have had it before; and he eulogizes the judges for their acuteness in detecting that, if children come [to Baptism] under the weight of that original sin which deserves God's wrath and damnation, it is a contradiction to say they are in the possession of his grace. But can we argue at all upon such mysteries? Or, if it be allowable to do so, may we not reply, that there is nothing more abhorrent from the Divine œconomy in a sinful child becoming suddenly holy, than there is in an adult becoming suddenly converted, as we believe is not unfrequently the fact? Is there any thing more at variance with human reason in maintaining, with the Bishop, that children are made worthy from being unworthy recipients, by an instantaneous act of grace *at the time of Baptism*, than with Mr. Goode, that they become so *at some point of time anterior to Baptism*? Which ever be the exact moment when their Sanctification commences, up to that moment they must have been *aliens from*, and immediately therefrom and thenceforward have been *received into*, God's favour. Nor, again, is it more irreconcilable with the theory of the regenerating influence of a Sacrament (as has been objected by another class of disputants), that children should not grow up holier than we see they do, than that adults, of whom we do not hesitate to believe that they have received worthily the Lord's Supper, should not exhibit afterwards a life corresponding in all points to such a reception. Can we trace the mind of a child, and the first workings of its will? Can we tell how soon, or when first, or by what imperceptible degrees and ways and means it does despite to its Baptismal grace and purity?

Once more, and we have done for ever with Mr. Goode. He treats the Bishop as having denied the capability of infants *for God's favour*²⁶, when his only denial was that they were capable of the qualifications of *faith and repentance*! And the reader's attention is again led off to contemplate the absurdity of such a denial, which the Bishop not only never made, but could never have dreamed of making, because he had already said that they could not have the Sacrament administered *without* that favour, and had, according to Mr. Goode, torn up his doctrine from the very roots, by his own hands, *for saying so*!

We have neither space nor inclination to go through more of Mr. Goode's Letter. The above specimens may suffice as illustra-

²⁵ Letter, p. 60.

²⁶ Ibid. p. 65.

tions of the loose and inconclusive reasoning on which he has rested his own and his party's defence to the Letter of the Bishop of Exeter. But it is not for the sake of a mere intellectual treat as critics, nor yet as the moral censors of Mr. Goode, that we have thus dwelt upon our subject: we have a higher and more important object in view. There is a party among us, we lament to own, respectable in numbers, pre-eminent in piety, who regard the decision of the Judicial Committee as a righteous verdict. They believe that the Church *has* left the question of Baptismal Regeneration an open one. They begin to suspect she *has* forfeited her claim to be deemed the depositary of Catholic truth. They talk of consulting their own safety by flying to another communion. Is this an imaginary fear? We ourselves have conversed with those who, holding high preferment in our Universities, and having devoted the best years of their life with extraordinary zeal and fidelity to parochial labours, are now on the eve of parting for ever with the principles and precepts of their youth and manhood, and giving themselves over, temporally and spiritually, to a Church not our own. We would implore such, by all the persuasiveness we can command, to pause ere it be too late. We would beseech them to reflect on the temerity, we had nearly said, the common dishonesty, of such a course. Was it a thing unknown to you, we would ask, when you bound yourselves over to the service of the Church of England that she was in thralldom to the State? "*Qui sentit commodum debet sentire et onus*" is an old adage, and full of truth. You accepted her liabilities, when you availed yourselves of her privileges, *with your eyes open*. What were they? On the one hand, her high Apostolical descent; her unrivalled purity of doctrine; her great temporal advantages. On the other, her dependence on the State. What will you exchange her for? Will you abandon her for the untried regions of Papal autocracy, or hope for recognition by Scottish Episcopacy? You knew what she was when you did homage to her. Her constitution has not changed since then. Her Convocations were a dead letter—legal substances, but, like many other legal substances, literal shadows—long before you were born. Can you plead the non-revival of her ancient self-government as an excuse for your desertion of her ranks? Do you deplore her want of discipline? Look around you, and see how day after day is gradually and certainly restoring it. Surely, if ever, she has need *now* of her staunchest defenders. Is it comely to leave her in the battle-tide? Because a Court of Justice has declared her mind to be *what you at least must admit—since you think that declaration just—has ever been her mind*, can you in consistency cease to cleave unto her? Her laws are what they

ever were. The Judges have interpreted, not made them. Remember, too, it is a solemn thing to trample under foot a vow. There was no mental reservation in your plighted troth to her. An oath is a conditionless and absolute thing. And by how much the more you deem her doctrines of Baptism fundamental Articles of Faith, in that exact proportion do you stand precluded from releasing yourselves from the self-devotion which you have pledged to her. If in politics, surely much more in Religion, is a change of opinions in fundamentals—TREASON!

To those who, with us, repudiate the Judgment of the Judicial Committee, let us, in conclusion, recapitulate the reasons why we venture to impugn it on legal grounds.

Firstly, we charge them with not having followed out their own undertaking, to apply to the case before them the same rules of construction “which are applicable to all written instruments;” for had they done so, they would have resorted, in the first instance, to the Church’s language in her Baptismal Services as an exponent of her doctrines upon Baptism.

Secondly, we charge them with not observing, that the Baptismal Services contain Articles of Faith as well as forms of devotion; and particularly, with not heeding, though sitting as an Ecclesiastical tribunal, that Canon of the Church which, in ample terms, declares the all-sufficiency of those Services to determine a doctrinal question.

Thirdly, we charge them with inferring the Church’s mind on Baptism from her mind as disclosed in the Burial of her dead; and with failing to perceive that, those respective Services not being in *pari materia*, it was to be expected that she would adopt, when speaking of a Sacrament, a more positive tone of teaching than when speaking of a non-sacramental rite.

Fourthly, we charge them with resorting to the extrinsic evidence of the other Formularies of the Church, though no ambiguity, or variance with the language of her other Formularies, was proved to exist in her Baptismal Services.

Fifthly, we charge them with having introduced an hypothetical principle of construction into the Church’s Code, and into all other Codes, civil as well as ecclesiastical, which, once introduced, it is impossible henceforward to limit, and must tend to throw the interpretation of all written instruments into doubt and confusion.

Sixthly, we charge them with having unduly *regarded* the opinions of individual Divines, which, even if they were admissible evidence at all, do not always agree with those of one another, and sometimes are inconsistent with themselves, and are at least opposed to those of living Divines entitled to respect.

Seventhly, we charge them with having unduly *disregarded* the explicit unanimous declaration, *upon the exact controverted point*, of those Divines, most, if not all, of whom were members of the very Synod which finally settled the Book of Common Prayer, and whose opinions therefore it is invaluable to possess, not as being those of isolated individuals, but as those of a body exercising, simultaneously with what Mr. Goode calls the *unauthoritative* Conference at the Savoy, what he must allow to be at least the *authoritative* functions of a Convocation.

Lastly, and above all, we charge them with failing to perceive that the inseparability of the grace of Infant Baptism from its administration is the *strict necessary logical consequence* of the Church's doctrine on adult Baptism; inasmuch as if she dispenses (as she declares she does) in the case of infants, with those conditions, which if fulfilled, she declares bring grace to adults, it follows *as a matter of course*, (if one may so speak,) that she cannot but accord to the former *without*, the benefits which she accords to the latter *with*, those same pre-requisites.

Nor let us be deemed presumptuous for arraigning the Justice of this Judgment. Lawyers, no more than Popes, are infallible. The Decree of a Judicial Committee no more forms the Code of the Catholic Church than did, of yore, those of Emperors. The mind of a Master of the Rolls may be less sagacious than that of a Vice-Chancellor. The theological lore of an Exchequer Baron is probably less profound than that of a Judge of the Court of Arches. One Bishop may equal two Archbishops. The Learned of the land are not unanimous. There has not been even any great preponderance of opinion among them. Nay, whilst we write, the foundations of this appellate tribunal are being shaken. The authority of laymen in Controversies of Faith may even yet be superseded. A little while, and who knows but the Judgment of this anomalous Judicature may be reversed, or at all events overruled; and the Hierarchy of our land seen installed, in their proper place, as the legalized Interpreters of the mind of our Church?

- ART. VII.**—1. *The Book of Mormon ; an Account written by the hand of Mormon, upon Plates taken from the Plates of Nephi. Translated by JOSEPH SMITH, Jun., Kirtland, Ohio. Printed by O. Cowdery and Co., for P. P. Pratt and J. Goodson, 1837 ; (the second American edition, the first being published in 1830.) Second European edition, Liverpool, published by Orson Pratt. 1849.*
2. *The Book of Doctrines and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints ; selected from the Revelations of God, by JOSEPH SMITH, President. Second European edition (first in 1845), Liverpool : Orson Pratt. 1849.*
3. *The History of the Saints, or an Exposé of Joe Smith and Mormonism. By JOHN C. BENNETT, General and Doctor of Medicine, Boston, and New York. Leland and Whiting. 1842.*
4. *The City of the Mormons, or Three Days at Nauvoo, in 1842. By the Rev. H. CASWALL, M.A., author of " America and the American Church." Second edition, revised and enlarged. London : Rivingtons. 1843.*
5. *The Prophet of the Nineteenth Century ; or the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Mormons, or Latter Day Saints : to which is appended, an Analysis of the Book of Mormon. By the Rev. H. CASWALL, M.A., Professor of Divinity, Kemper College, Missouri ; and author of " America and the American Church," " City of the Mormons," &c. London : Rivingtons. 1843.*
6. *Letters exhibiting the most prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. By ORSON SPENCER, A.B., President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in Europe, in reply to the Rev. William Caswall, A.M., Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A. Liverpool : published by Orson Spencer, 1847, and collated in one volume, 1848.*

THERE are few persons, probably, who have not, at one time or another, heard of the existence of a sect called the " Mormonites," or " Latter Day Saints," and of the crowds of deluded fanatics, who, under those names, have, from time to time, quitted the shores of this country, on their way to a new land of promise in the Far West. But among those under whose notice this one among the many religious phenomena of the present day has occasionally fallen, there are few, we apprehend, who have ever troubled themselves to inquire into the origin or peculiar tenets

of the new sect,—few who have any conception of its numerical extent,—still fewer who have viewed it in its more important aspect as one of the “signs of the times.” It is hard to say, how long this indifference of the more enlightened portion of the Christian public to the proceedings of the followers of Mormon might have continued, but for an attempt recently made to constrain a clergyman of our Church to desecrate the Burial Service at the grave of one of the members of the sect. While it appeared,—as in Mr. Caswall’s two publications, Nos. 4 and 5, at the head of this article, and in a brief notice in a number of the *Church of England Quarterly*, some years ago, from the pen, we believe, of the Rev. Hartwell Horne,—simply as one of the extravagant phases of American religionism, it was not likely to excite any very lively interest in this country; but the case is altogether different when we find that the pestilence is spreading extensively in our parishes, as we fear it is, especially in the manufacturing districts; and that the spirit of ribaldry towards the Church, by which it has been characterized from the first, is changed into a spirit of persecution, endeavouring to expose her sacred offices to irreverent, and, if the profanation were acquiesced in, not altogether unmerited, scorn. The Church owes a debt of obligation of no ordinary kind to Mr. Sweet, for the firmness with which he resolved to withstand the nefarious demand made upon him by a family of Mormonites in his parish, for the manifest purpose of bringing the Church and her ministry into contempt among the people, and thus paving the way for a more ready reception of those misrepresentations of the Church’s system, upon which those new sectarians rely to so great an extent for the recommendation of their own. In his own statement of the case¹ he has very properly taken a wider range, and considered the general state of the law as regards the obligation to use the Burial Office in cases for which it certainly never was intended. But the facts incidentally disclosed in his pamphlet, as to the pernicious tendency of the sect with which he has been brought into conflict, are such as are sure to excite very general attention, and we have therefore thought we should be doing good service to our readers, and especially to the clerical portion of them, if we put them in possession of the leading features of the Mormonite heresy, and of so much of its history as will enable them to appreciate the character of its founders and promoters.

With this view we have collected together a vast mass of documentary evidence, which we shall endeavour to present to our

¹ *The Defence of a Refusal to Profane the “Order for the Burial of the Dead:” with a Preface, dedicated to Members of Church Unions.* By James Bradby Sweet, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Woodville. London: Cleaver, 1850.

readers in a condensed and digested form. In doing so we hold ourselves wholly absolved from the necessity of dealing with the errors, the absurdities and blasphemies of the sect in the way of controversy. The imposture is too palpable, the heresy too manifest, to call for serious argument. The most efficient way to expose the imposture is to state the facts, as we find them set forth both by the Mormonite leaders themselves, and by certain parties who have broken off their former connexion with them,—the most powerful confutation of the heresy, to exhibit their doctrine as it is propounded by themselves, both originally in their doctrinal documents, and subsequently in their apologetic writings.

We shall begin our account by putting the Mormonite prophet himself into the witness-box. A History of the different American Sects—altogether forty-three in number—published at Philadelphia in the year 1844², contains, (pp. 404—410,) on the subject of the Mormonites, an article from the pen of Joseph Smith, under the title “Latter Day Saints, by Joseph Smith, Nauvoo, Illinois.” The writer begins by stating that

“The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, was founded upon direct revelation, as the true Church of God has ever been, according to the Scriptures (Amos iii. 7, and Acts i. 2); and through the will and blessings of God, I have been an instrument in his hands, thus far, to move forward the cause of Zion.”

He then proceeds to give a sketch of his own life. He was born, according to his own account, on the 23rd of December, 1805, at Sharon, Windsor County, in the State of Vermont, whence his parents removed, when he was about ten years old, to Palmyra, in the State of New York, and, after an interval of four years, to Manchester, in the same state, which was the scene of the first supernatural events in his life. At the age of fourteen, he states, he was much troubled in mind by observing the contradictions of the different religious denominations around him, and in his anxiety to be delivered from the confusion of mind thence ensuing, he was fervent in prayer for illumination from above. While thus engaged in a secret recess of a grove, he had a vision :

² The following is the title of this curious publication, in which the different sects are all permitted to tell their own tale :—*HE PASA ECCLESIA. An Original History of the Religious Denominations at present existing in the United States, containing authentic Accounts of their Rise, Progress, Statistics, and Doctrines. Written expressly for the Work by eminent Theological Professors, Ministers, and Lay Members of the respective Denominations. Projected, compiled, and arranged by J. Daniel Rapp, of Lancaster Pa., Author of “Der Märtyrer Geschichte,” &c. &c. Philadelphia: Humphreys. 1844.*

"I was enwrapt in a heavenly vision, and saw two glorious personages, who exactly resembled each other in features and likeness, surrounded with a brilliant light, which eclipsed the sun at noon-day. They told me that all the religious denominations were believing in incorrect doctrines, and that none of them was acknowledged of God as his Church and kingdom. And I was expressly commanded to 'go not after them,' at the same time receiving a promise that the fulness of the gospel should at some future time be made known unto me."

This promise was fulfilled about three years after, when, on the 21st of September, 1823, being then near eighteen years old, he had in a room, three times repeated the same night, a vision of an angel who declared to him :

"That the preparatory work for the second coming of the Messiah was speedily to commence; that the time was at hand for the gospel in all its fulness to be preached in power, unto all nations, that a people might be prepared for the millennial reign. I was informed that I was chosen to be an instrument in the hands of God, to bring about some of his purposes in this glorious dispensation."

At the same time the Angel gave him "a brief sketch" of the origin and early history of the aboriginal inhabitants of America, and informed him that certain "plates of records," containing the details of which the Angel gave the epitome, were deposited in a certain place specified by the heavenly messenger. This was followed by many subsequent visits of Angels, till at last, on the morning of the 22nd of September, 1827, the Angel of the Lord delivered the records themselves into Joseph's hands.

"These records were engraven on plates which had the appearance of gold; each plate was six inches wide and eight inches long, and not quite so thick as common tin. They were filled with engravings in Egyptian characters, and bound together in a volume, as the leaves of a book, with three rings running through the whole. The volume was something near six inches in thickness, a part of which was sealed. The characters on the unsealed part were small and beautifully engraved. The whole book exhibited many marks of antiquity in its construction, and much skill in the art of engraving. With the records was found a curious instrument, which the ancients called 'Urim and Thummim,' which consisted of two transparent stones set in the rim on a bow fastened to a breastplate. Through the medium of the Urim and Thummim, I translated the record, by the gift and power of God³."

³ It is worth while to compare with this the account which Joseph Smith gave to one of his comrades, at the time when he first started the imposture, and before he had any idea himself of the extent to which the business might grow. An affidavit of Peter Ingersoll, one of Joseph Smith's acquaintances in early life, after giving a general account of the character of Smith, and of his occupations and practices as a money-digger, thus proceeds :—

"One day he came, and greeted me with a joyful countenance. Upon asking the

The translation, so made, is the celebrated Book of Mormon, (No. 1. at the head of this Article,) of which a brief abstract is inserted in the narrative. The prophet then proceeds to relate the origin of his Church :—

“ On the 6th of April, 1830, the ‘ Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints,’ was first organized in the town of Manchester, Ontario County, State of New York. Some few were called and ordained by the Spirit of revelation and prophecy, and began to preach as the Spirit gave them utterance, and though weak, yet were they strengthened by the power of God ; and many were brought to repentance, were immersed in the water, and were filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. They saw visions and prophesied, devils were cast out, and the sick healed by the laying on of hands. From that time the work rolled forth with astonishing rapidity.”

Next follows an enumeration of the various settlements successively effected by his followers, in Jackson County, in Clay County, and in Caldwell and Davies Counties, in the State of Missouri, from all which they were ejected, from the latter in 1838, when they were, according to Smith’s account, from 12,000 to 15,000 in number. On their expulsion from Caldwell and Davies Counties, they migrated to Hancock County, in the State of Illinois, where, in the “ fall ” of 1839, they commenced a city, which, in December, 1840, obtained an Act of Incorporation from the Legislature of Illinois, and received from its founder the name of “ Nauvoo,” signifying “ beautiful.” The city is described at the date of the account as containing 1500 houses, and upwards of 15,000 inhabitants. It was graced by an “ University,” and defended by a military body raised from the inhabitants themselves, called the “ Nauvoo Legion,” commanded by a “ Lieutenant-General ” (a Mormonite), but subject to the superior authority of

cause of his unusual happiness, he replied in the following language :—‘ As I was passing yesterday across the woods, after a heavy shower of rain, I found, in a hollow, some beautiful white sand, that had been washed up by the water. I took off my frock, and tied up several quarts of it, and then went home. On my entering the house I found the family at the table, eating dinner. They were anxious to know the contents of my frock. At that moment, I happened to think of what I had heard about a history found in Canada, called the golden Bible ; so I very gravely told them it was the golden Bible. To my surprise, they were credulous enough to believe what I said. Accordingly, I told them that I had received a commandment to let no one see it ; for, says I, no man can see it with the naked eye and live. However, I offered to take out the book and show it to them ; but they refused to see it, and left the room. Now,’ said Joe, ‘ I have got the d—d fools fixed, and will carry out the fun.’ Notwithstanding, he told me he had no such book, and believed there never was any such book ; yet, he told me that he actually went to Willard Chase, to get him to make a chest, in which he might deposit his golden Bible. But, as Chase would not do it, he made a box himself, of clapboards, and put it into a pillow-case, and allowed people only to lift it, and feel of it through the case,”—*Bennett’s History of the Saints*, pp. 63, 64.

the Governor of the State, and of the President of the United States. An eminence in this city was chosen for the site of the great Mormon temple, the building of which, at the date of the account, was still in progress :—

“The temple of God, now in the course of erection, being already raised one story, and which is 120 feet by 80 feet, of stone with polished pilasters, of an entire new order of architecture, will be a splendid house for the worship of God, as well as an unique wonder for the world, it being built by the direct revelation of Jesus Christ for the salvation of the living and the dead.”

From this temple and city as its centre, Mormonism spread itself far and wide, not only through the United States, but beyond the Atlantic into Europe, and into other parts of the world. Such at least is the prophet's account :—

“Besides the United States, where nearly every place of notoriety has heard the glad tidings of the Gospel of the Son of God, England, Ireland, and Scotland have shared largely in the fulness of the everlasting gospel, and thousands been already gathered with their kindred saints to this the corner-stone of Zion. Missionaries of this Church have gone to the East Indies, to Australia, Germany, Constantinople, Egypt, Palestine, the Islands of the Pacific, and are now preparing to open the door in the extensive dominions of Russia.

“There are no correct data by which the exact number of members composing this now extensive, and still extending, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, can be known. Should it be supposed at 150,000, it might still be short of the truth.”

So far the account given by Joseph Smith through the medium of “*HE PASA ECCLESIA*.” We now turn to the history of the alleged revelations given to Joseph Smith from time to time, and recorded in the second of the Mormonite Standard Books. The first of these books is the Book of Mormon already referred to, which, containing what are alleged to be certain ancient records, answers in a manner to the Old Testament of the sacred volume, while the place of the New Testament is filled by “The Book of Doctrines and Covenants” (No. 2 at the head of this article). This volume, which was printed and published separately, consists of two parts ; viz. Seven “Lectures on Faith,” or an abstract of Mormonite Doctrine in a homiletic form ; and a collection of “Covenants and Commandments,” given by revelation, from time to time, divided into 111 Sections. They do not in the collection follow in the order in which they are alleged to have been received ; but as the date is generally attached to them, we shall be able to follow the history of the prophet as traced out by himself in this “canonical” book. The earliest of

the revelations contained in it have reference to the translation of the "golden plates," and in particular to an untoward accident which happened at the very commencement of the work. Joseph Smith was employing an *amanuensis*, named Martin Harris, a farmer of some substance, and of an excitable temperament and unstable religious views, who from a Quaker had successively turned Methodist, Universalist, Baptist, and Presbyterian, and having grown tired of this last profession also, was at this time open to any religious novelty which might come in his way. On him Joseph Smith succeeded in palming off the story of the golden plates, and having embarked him in the enterprize, for which Harris was to find the money, he dictated to him from behind a curtain, from time to time, portions of what professed to be a translation of the golden Bible. While the work was thus progressing, Harris having taken home with him the first 116 pages of it, they were abstracted by an unfriendly hand, seemingly with the intention of embarrassing the prophet, and confuting him by the publication of them, if he should be unwary enough to attempt to reproduce them. To this circumstance allusion is made in a "revelation" dated July, 1828, in which it is said :

"Behold, thou art Joseph, and thou wast chosen to do the work of the Lord, but because of transgression, if thou art not aware thou wilt fall ; but remember God is merciful ; therefore, repent of that which thou hast done which is contrary to the commandment which I gave you, and thou art still chosen, and art again called to the work : except thou do this, thou shalt be delivered up and become as other men, and have no more gift.

"And when thou deliveredst up that which God had given thee sight and power to translate, thou deliveredst up that which was sacred into the hands of a wicked man, who has set at nought the counsels of God, and has broken the most sacred promises which were made before God, and has depended upon his own judgment, and boasted in his own wisdom, and this is the reason that *thou hast lost thy privileges for a season*, for thou hast suffered the counsel of thy director to be trampled upon from the beginning."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxx. §§ 4, 5.

The work of translation was thus suspended, in the hope, no doubt, that the lost manuscript might be recovered ; but all endeavours to procure its restitution (Harris's wife was the thief) having proved fruitless, another revelation was given in May, 1829 :

"Now, behold, I say unto you, that because you delivered up those writings which you had power given unto you to translate, by the means of the Urim and Thummim, into the hands of a wicked man,

you have lost them ; and *you also lost your gift at the same time, and your mind became darkened ; nevertheless, it is now restored unto you again*, therefore see that you are faithful and continue on unto the finishing of the remainder of the work of translation as you have begun : do not run faster, or labour more than you have strength and means provided to enable, you to translate ; but be diligent unto the end : pray always, that you may come off conqueror ; yea, that you may conquer Satan, and that you may escape the hands of the servants of Satan that do uphold his work. Behold, they have sought to destroy you ; yea, even the man in whom you have trusted, has sought to destroy you. And for this cause I said that he is a wicked man, for he has sought to take away the things wherewith you have been intrusted ; and he has also sought to destroy your gift ; and because you have delivered the writings into his hands, behold wicked men have taken them from you : therefore, you have delivered them up ; yea, that which was sacred unto ^{your} ~~your~~ ^{holiness} ~~holiness~~. And, behold, Satan has put it into their hearts to alter the words which you have caused to be written, or which you have translated, which have gone out of your hands : and, behold, I say unto you, that because they have altered the words, they read contrary from that which you translated and caused to be written ; and, on this wise, the devil has sought to lay a cunning plan, that he may destroy this work ; for he has put into their hearts to do this, that by lying they may say they have caught you in the words which you have *pretended to translate*.

“ Verily, I say unto you, that I will not suffer that Satan shall accomplish his evil design in this thing, for, behold, he has put it into their hearts to get thee to tempt the Lord thy God, in asking to translate it over again ; and then, behold, they say and think in their hearts, we will see if God has given him power to translate ; if so, He will also give him power again ; and if God giveth him power again, or if he translates again, or, in other words, if he bringeth forth the same words, behold, we have the same with us, and we have altered them : therefore, they will not agree, and we will say that he has lied in his words, and that he has no gift, and that he has no power : therefore, we will destroy him, and also the work, and we will do this that we may not be ashamed in the end, and that we may get glory of the world . .

“ Now, behold, they have altered these words, because Satan saith unto them, *He hath deceived you* : and thus he flattereth them away to do iniquity, to get thee to tempt the Lord thy God.

“ Behold, I say unto you, that you shall not translate again those words which have gone forth out of your hands ; for, behold, they shall not accomplish their evil designs in lying against those words. For, behold, if you should bring forth the same words *they will say that you have lied ; that you have pretended to translate, but that you have contradicted yourself* : and, behold, they will publish this, and Satan will harden the hearts of the people to stir them up to anger against you, that they will not believe my words. Thus Satan thinketh to overpower your testimony in this generation, that the work may not come forth in this

generation : but, behold, here is wisdom, and because I show unto you wisdom, and give you commandments concerning these things, what you shall do, show it not unto the world until you have accomplished the work of translation.

“ Marvel not that I said unto you, here is wisdom, show it not unto the world, for I said show it not unto the world, that you may be preserved. Behold, I do not say that you shall not show it unto the righteous ; but as you cannot always judge the righteous, or as you cannot always tell the wicked from the righteous, therefore, I say unto you, hold your peace until I shall see fit to make all things known unto the world concerning the matter.

“ And now, verily I say unto you, that an account of those things that you have written, which have gone out of your hands, are engraven upon the plates of Nephi ; yea, and you remember it was said in those writings that *a more particular account was given of these things upon the plates of Nephi.*

“ And now, because the account which is engraven upon the plates of Nephi is more particular concerning the things which, in my wisdom, I would bring to the knowledge of the people in this account, therefore *you shall translate the engravings which are on the plates of Nephi, down even till you come to the reign of king Benjamin, or until you come to that which you have translated, which you have retained ; and behold, you shall publish it as the record of Nephi,* and thus I will confound those who have altered my words. I will not suffer that they shall destroy my work ; yea, I will show unto them that my wisdom is greater than the cunning of the devil.

“ Behold, *they have only got a part, or an abridgment of the account of Nephi.* Behold, there are many things engraven on the plates of Nephi which do throw greater views upon my gospel ; therefore, it is wisdom in me that you should translate this first part of the engravings of Nephi, and send forth in this work. And, behold, all the remainder of this work does contain all those parts of my gospel which my holy prophets, yea, and also my disciples, desired in their prayers should come forth unto this people. And I said unto them, that it should be granted unto them according to their faith in their prayers ; yea, and this was their faith, that my gospel which I gave unto them, that they might preach in their days, might come unto their brethren the Lamanites, and also all that had become Lamanites because of their dissensions.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxxvi. §§ 1, 2. 5—10.

The history of this *contre-temps*, which seriously perplexed the prophet for a time, is recounted with still greater plainness in the Preface to the first American edition of the Book of Mormon, published in 1830 ; but in the second American, and in both the European editions of the book, that preface has been suppressed. The passage in question is curious :

“ As many false reports have been circulated respecting the follow-

ing work, and also many unlawful measures taken by evil designing persons to destroy me, and also the work ; I would inform you that I translated by the gift and power of God, and caused to be written one hundred and sixteen pages, the which I took from the book of Lehi, which was an account abridged from the plates of Lehi by the hand of Mormon ; which said account some person or persons have stolen and kept from me, notwithstanding *my utmost exertions to recover it again* ; and being commanded of the Lord that I should not translate the same over again, for Satan had put it into their hearts to tempt the Lord their God, by altering the words, that they did read contrary from that which I translated and caused to be written : and if I should bring forth the same words again, or, in other words, if I should translate the same over again, they would publish that which they had stolen, and Satan would stir up the hearts of this generation, that they might not receive this work ; but, behold ! the Lord said unto me, I will not suffer that Satan shall accomplish his evil design in this thing ; therefore thou shalt translate from the plates of Nephi, until ye come to that which ye have translated, which ye have retained ; and behold, ye shall publish it as the record of Nephi ; and thus I will confound those who have altered my words. I will not suffer that they shall destroy my work ; yea, I will show unto them that my wisdom is greater than the cunning of the devil. Wherefore, to be obedient unto the commandments of God, I have, through his grace and mercy, accomplished that which He hath commanded me respecting this thing. I would also inform you that the plates of which hath been spoken, were found in the township of Manchester, Ontario County, New York."

From the tone in which Harris the scribe—"the wicked man"—is spoken of in the above revelation, it would appear that the prophet was not without suspicion of his fidelity ; and Harris, on his part, seems to have been uncomfortably pressing for a sight of the golden plates from which the prophet was translating, or "pretending to translate." The curiosity of the scribe was accordingly repressed, and his fears and his "faith" wrought upon to make him an eye-witness of what he had *not* seen, by "revelation," in the manner following.

"Behold, I say unto you, that as my servant Martin Harris *has desired a witness at my hand, that you, my servant Joseph Smith, jun., have got the plates of which you have testified and borne record that you have received* of me ; and now, behold, this shall you say unto him,—he who spake unto you said unto you, I, the Lord, am God, and have given these things unto you, my servant Joseph Smith, jun., and have commanded you that you should stand as a witness of these things, and I have caused you that you should enter into a covenant with me, that *you should not show them, except to those persons to whom I commanded you* ; and you have no power over them, except I grant it unto you. And you have a gift to translate the plates, and this is the first gift

that I bestowed upon you, and *I have commanded that you should PRETEND to no other gift until my purpose is fulfilled in this* ; for I will grant unto you no other gift until it is finished.

“ Verily, I say unto you, that *woe shall come unto the inhabitants of the earth if they will not hearken unto my words* ; for hereafter you shall be ordained, and go forth and deliver my words unto the children of men. Behold, *if they will not believe my words, they would not believe you, my servant Joseph, if it were possible that you could show them all these things* which I have committed unto you. O ! this unbelieving and stiffnecked generation ! *mine anger is kindled against them.*

“ Behold, verily I say unto you, I have reserved those things which I have entrusted unto you, my servant Joseph, for a wise purpose in me, and it shall be made known unto future generations ; but *this generation shall have my word through you* ; and in addition to your testimony, the testimony of *three of my servants, whom I shall call and ordain, unto whom I will show these things*, and they shall go forth with *my words that are given through you* ; yea, they shall know of a surety that these things are true, for from heaven will I declare it unto them. *I will give them power that they may behold and view these things as they are* ; and to none else will I grant this power to receive this same testimony among this generation, in this the beginning of the rising up and the coming forth of my church out of the wilderness, clear as the moon, and fair as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners. And *the testimony of three witnesses will I send forth of my word* : and behold, whosoever believeth on my words them will I visit with the manifestation of my Spirit, and they shall be born of me, even of water and of the Spirit. And you must *wait yet a little while*, for ye are not yet ordained ; and their testimony shall also go forth unto the condemnation of this generation, if they harden their hearts against them ; for a desolating scourge shall go forth among the inhabitants of the earth, and shall continue to be poured out from time to time, if they repent not, until the earth is empty, and the inhabitants thereof are consumed away and utterly destroyed by the brightness of my coming. Behold, I tell you these things, even as I also told the people of the destruction of Jerusalem ; and my word shall be verified at this time, as it hath hitherto been verified.

“ And now I command you, my servant Joseph, to repent and walk more uprightly before me, and *yield to the persuasions of men no more* ; and that you be firm in keeping the commandments wherewith I have commanded you ; and if you do this, behold I grant unto you eternal life, even if you should be slain.

“ And now again I speak unto you, my servant Joseph, concerning the man that desires the witness. Behold, I say unto him, *he exalts himself, and does not humble himself sufficiently before me* ; but if he will *bow down before me, and humble himself in mighty prayer and faith, in the sincerity of his heart, then will I grant unto him a view of the things which he desires to see.* And then he shall say unto the people of this generation, Behold, I have seen the things which the Lord has shown

unto Joseph Smith, jun., and I know of a surety that they are true, for *I have seen them, for they have been shown unto me by the power of God, and not of man.* And I, the Lord, command him, my servant Martin Harris, that *he shall say no more unto them concerning these things, except he shall say, I have seen them, and they have been shown unto me by the power of God,* and these are the words which he shall say; but *if he deny this, he will break the covenant which he has before covenanted with me, and behold he is condemned.* And now, *except he humble himself, and acknowledge unto me the things that he has done which are wrong, and covenant with me that he will keep my commandments, and exercise faith in me, behold I say unto him, he shall have no such views,* for I will grant unto him no views of the things of which I have spoken. And if this be the case, I command you my servant Joseph, that you shall say unto him, that *he shall do no more, nor trouble me any more concerning this matter.*

“And if this be the case, behold, I say unto thee, Joseph, when thou hast translated a few more pages thou shalt *stop for a season*, even until I command thee again; then thou mayest translate again. And except thou do this, behold, thou shalt have no more gift, and I will take away the things which I have entrusted with thee. And now, because I foresee the lying in wait to destroy thee, yea, *I foresee that if my servant Martin Harris humbleth not himself, and receive a witness from my hand, that he will fall into transgression,* and there are many that lie in wait to destroy thee from off the face of the earth; and for this cause, that thy days may be prolonged, I have given unto thee these commandments; yea, for this cause I have said, Stop, and stand still until I command thee, and I will provide means whereby thou mayest accomplish the thing which I have commanded thee; and if thou art faithful in keeping my commandments, thou shalt be lifted up at the last day. Amen.”
—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxxii.

While this revelation, given in March, 1829, in the interval between the suspension of the work in July, 1828, and its resumption in May, 1829, was working in the mind of Martin Harris, another instrument was in training, in the person of one Oliver Cowdery, a school-teacher and Baptist preacher in the neighbourhood; to whom, in April, 1829, divers “revelations” were given, through Joseph Smith, from which the following are extracts.

“Behold thou hast a gift, and blessed art thou because of thy gift. Remember it is sacred, and cometh from above: and if thou wilt inquire, thou shalt know mysteries which are great and marvellous: therefore thou shalt exercise thy gift, that thou mayest find out mysteries, that thou mayest bring many to the knowledge of the truth; yea, convince them of the error of their ways. Make not thy gift known unto any, save it be those who are of thy faith. Trifle not with sacred things. If thou wilt do good, yea, and hold out faithful to the end, thou shalt be

saved in the kingdom of God, which is the greatest of all the gifts of God ; for there is no gift greater than the gift of salvation.

“ Verily, verily, I say unto thee, blessed art thou for what thou hast done ; for thou hast inquired of me, and, behold, as often as thou hast inquired, thou hast received instruction of my spirit. If it had not been so, thou wouldst not have come to the place where thou art at this time.

“ Behold, thou knowest that thou hast inquired of me, and I did enlighten thy mind ; and now I tell thee these things, that thou mayest know that thou hast been enlightened by the spirit of truth ; yea, I tell thee, that thou mayest know that there is none else save God, that knowest thy thoughts and the intents of thy heart : I tell thee these things as a witness unto thee that the words or the work which thou hast been writing is true.

“ Therefore be diligent, stand by my servant Joseph, faithfully, in whatsoever difficult circumstances he may be for the word's sake. Admonish him in his faults, and also receive admonition of him. Be patient ; be sober ; be temperate ; have patience, faith, hope, and charity.

“ Behold, thou art Oliver, and I have spoken unto thee because of thy desires ; therefore treasure up these words in thy heart. Be faithful and diligent in keeping the commandments of God, and I will encircle thee in the arms of my love.

“ Behold, I am Jesus Christ, the Son of God. I am the same that came unto my own, and my own received me not. I am the light which shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not.

“ Verily, verily, I say unto you, if you desire a further witness, cast your mind upon the night that you cried unto me in your heart, that you might know concerning the truth of these things. Did I not speak peace to your mind concerning the matter ? What greater witness can you have than from God ? And now, behold, you have received a witness, for if I have told you things which no man knoweth, have you not received a witness ? And, behold, I grant unto you a gift, if you desire of me, to translate even as my servant Joseph.

“ Verily, verily, I say unto you, that there are records which contain much of my gospel, which have been kept back because of the wickedness of the people ; and now I command you, that if you have good desires—a desire to lay up treasures for yourself in heaven—then shall you assist in bringing to light, with your gift, those parts of my scriptures which have been hidden because of iniquity.

“ And now, behold, I give unto you, and also unto my servant Joseph, the keys of this gift, which shall bring to light this ministry ; and in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.

“ Verily, verily, I say unto you, if they reject my words, and this part of my gospel and ministry, blessed are ye, for they can do no more unto you than unto me ; and if they do unto you, even as they have done unto me, blessed are ye, for you shall dwell with me in glory ; but if they reject not my words, which shall be established by the testi-

mony which shall be given, blessed are they, and then shall ye have joy in the fruit of your labours."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. viii. §§ 5—14.

In another revelation it is said :

" Oliver Cowdery, verily, verily I say unto you, that assuredly as the Lord liveth, who is your God and your Redeemer, even so surely shall you receive a knowledge of whatsoever things you shall ask in faith, with an honest heart, believing that you shall receive a knowledge concerning the engravings of old records, which are ancient, which contain those parts of my scripture of which have been spoken by the manifestation of my spirit; yea, behold, I will tell you in your mind and in your heart, by the Holy Ghost, which shall come upon you and which shall dwell in your heart.

" Doubt not, for it is the gift of God, and you shall hold it in your hands, and do marvellous works; and no power shall be able to take it away out of your hands, for it is the work of God. And, therefore, whatsoever you shall ask me to tell you, by that means that will I grant unto you, and you shall have knowledge concerning it: remember that without faith you can do nothing, therefore, ask in faith. Trifle not with these things: do not ask for that which you ought not: ask that you may know the mysteries of God, and that you may translate and receive knowledge from all those ancient records which have been hid up, that are sacred, and according to your faith shall it be done unto you. Behold, it is I that have spoken it; and I am the same who spake unto you from the beginning. Amen."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxxiv.

Lastly, the hope of becoming himself a translator, which the preceding "revelations" had raised, is dashed to the ground by another "revelation," still in April, 1829, which reduces him to the simple condition of *amanuensis*.

" Behold, I say unto you, my son, that because you did not translate according to that which you desired of me, and did commence again to write for my servant, Joseph Smith, jun., even so I would that ye should continue until you have finished this record, which I have intrusted unto him: and then, behold, other records have I, that I will give unto you power that you may assist to translate.

" Be patient, my son, for it is wisdom in me, and it is not expedient that you should translate at this present time. Behold, the work which you are called to do, is to write for my servant Joseph; and, behold, it is because that you did not continue as you commenced, when you began to translate, that I have taken away this privilege from you. Do not murmur, my son, for it is wisdom in me that I have dealt with you after this manner.

" Behold, you have not understood; you have supposed that I would give it unto you, when you took no thought, save it was to ask

me ; but, behold, I say unto you, that you must study it out in your mind ; then you must ask me if it be right, and if it is right I will cause that your bosom shall burn within you ; therefore, you shall feel that it is right ; but if it be not right, you shall have no such feelings, but you shall have a stupor of thought, that shall cause you to forget the thing which is wrong : therefore you cannot write that which is sacred, save it be given you from me.

“ Now if you had known this, you could have translated ; nevertheless, it is not expedient that you should translate now. Behold, it was expedient when you commenced, but you feared and the time is past, and it is not expedient now : for, do ye not behold that I have given unto my servant Joseph sufficient strength, whereby it is made up ; and neither of you have I condemned.

“ Do this thing which I have commanded you, and you shall prosper. Be faithful, and yield to no temptation. Stand fast in the work wherewith I have called you, and a hair of your head shall not be lost, and you shall be lifted up at the last day. Amen.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxxv.

The work was now resumed, Harris and Cowdery acting as assistants ; and in the mean time “ revelations ” were given to various other parties, several of whom appear afterwards among the first founders and leaders of the sect. They are much of the same character, partly almost in the same words, consisting of announcements of the “ great and marvellous work ” about to come forth, and of promises of spiritual endowments to the persons addressed, if they have a desire to assist in “ bringing forth and establishing ” it, and faith to believe in the word of the Lord by his prophet. The following, “ given to David Whitmer,” who, with Martin Harris and Oliver Cowdery, was chosen to fill up the number of three witnesses mentioned in Section xxxii., above quoted, may serve as a specimen :—

“ A great and marvellous work is about to come forth unto the children of men. Behold, I am God, and give heed to my word, which is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, to the dividing asunder of both joints and marrow ; therefore give heed unto my word.

“ Behold, the field is white already to harvest, therefore, whoso desireth to reap let him thrust in his sickle with his might and reap while the day lasts, that he may treasure up for his soul everlasting salvation in the kingdom of God ; yea, whosoever will thrust in his sickle and reap, the same is called of God ; therefore, if you will ask of me you shall receive, if you will knock it shall be opened unto you.

“ Seek to bring forth and establish my Zion. Keep my commandments in all things ; and if you keep my commandments and endure to the end, you shall have eternal life, which gift is the greatest of all the gifts of God.

"And it shall come to pass, that if you shall ask the Father in my name, in faith believing, you shall receive the Holy Ghost, which giveth utterance, that you may stand as a witness of the things of which you shall both hear and see, and also that you may declare repentance unto this generation.

"Behold, I am Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, who created the heavens and the earth; a light which cannot be hid in darkness; wherefore I must bring forth the fulness of my gospel from the Gentiles unto the house of Israel. And behold, thou art David, and thou art called to assist; which thing if ye do, and are faithful, ye shall be blessed both spiritually and temporally, and great shall be your reward. Amen."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxxix.

Shortly after, in the same month of June, 1829, the minds of the three witnesses were judged to be ripe for the operation of attesting their sight of that which they had not seen, and a "revelation" was given to the three conjointly.

"Behold, I say unto you, that you must *rely upon my word*, which if you do, with full purpose of heart, you shall have a view of the plates, and also of the breastplate, the sword of Laban, the Urim and Thummim, which were given to the brother of Jared upon the mount, when he talked with the Lord face to face, and the miraculous directors which were given to Lehi while in the wilderness, on the borders of the Red Sea; and it is *by your faith that you shall obtain a view of them*, even by that faith which was had by the prophets of old.

"And after that you have obtained faith, and have seen them with your eyes, *you shall testify of them, by the power of God*; and this you shall do *that my servant Joseph Smith, jun., may not be destroyed*, that I may bring about my righteous purposes unto the children of men in this work. And *ye shall testify that you have seen them, EVEN AS MY SERVANT JOSEPH SMITH, JUN., HAS SEEN THEM, for it is by my power that he hath seen them, and it is because he had faith*; and he has translated the book, even that part which I have commanded him, and as your Lord and your God liveth it is true.

"Wherefore you have received the same power, and the same faith, and the same gift like unto him; and if you do these last commandments of mine, which I have given you, the gates of hell shall not prevail against you; for my grace is sufficient for you, and you shall be lifted up at the last day. And I Jesus Christ, your Lord and your God, have spoken it unto you, that I might bring about my righteous purposes unto the children of men. Amen."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xlii.

Upon the strength of this "revelation," the prophet obtained, as an endorsement of his work, the following "Testimony of three Witnesses," which is appended or prefixed to all the editions of the Book of Mormon.

“ Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people unto whom this work shall come, that we, through the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, have seen the plates which contain this record, which is a record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites, their brethren, and also of the people of Jared, who came from the tower of which hath been spoken ; and *we also know that they have been translated by the gift and power of God, for his voice (i. e. through Joseph Smith) hath declared it unto us*; wherefore we know of a surety that the work is true. And we also testify that we have seen the engravings which are upon the plates ; and *they have been shewn unto us by the power of God, and not of man*. And we declare with words of soberness, that an Angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates, and the engravings thereon ; and we know that it is by the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, that we beheld and bear record that these things are true ; and it is marvellous in our eyes, nevertheless *the voice of the Lord commanded us that we should bear record of it* ; wherefore, to be obedient unto the commandments of God, we bear testimony of these things. And we know that if we are faithful in Christ, we shall rid our garments of the blood of all men, and be found spotless before the judgment-seat of Christ, and shall dwell with him eternally in the heavens. And the honour be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, which is one God. Amen.

“ OLIVER COWDERY,
DAVID WHITMER,
MARTIN HARRIS.”

To this testimony that of eight other witnesses is added, who profess to have handled the plates, and seen the engravings thereon ; but their declaration is brought in without any account of the circumstances under which they were admitted to the sight of a treasure so long and so mysteriously guarded, and they were one and all intimately connected with Joseph Smith, and embarked in his scheme, which they hoped would have been a lucrative one. Besides, though their names continue to appear in the successive editions of the Book of Mormon, of the eleven witnesses six apostatised from the faith in Joseph’s lifetime ; while of the other five three died before him, and two were his own brothers. No weight whatever, therefore, can attach to this attestation of the existence of the golden plates ; on the contrary, it makes rather against the authority of the prophet, since, in his “ revelations,” the number of persons who should be permitted to see the plates, is expressly limited to three. As regards the value of Harris’s testimony, in particular, the following anecdote is conclusive :—

“ On one occasion a sensible and religious gentleman in Palmyra put

the following question to Harris : ‘ Did you see those plates ? ’ Harris replied, that he did. ‘ But did you see the plates and the engravings on them with your bodily eyes ? ’ Harris replied, ‘ Yes, I saw them with my eyes ; they were shown unto me by the power of God, and not of man. ’ ‘ But did you see them with your natural, your bodily eyes, just as you see this pencil-case in my hand ? Now say *no* or *yes* to this. ’ Harris replied, ‘ I did not see them as I do that pencil-case, yet I saw them with the eye of faith ; I saw them just as distinctly as I see any thing around me, though at the time they were covered over with a cloth. ’ ”

It appears, indeed, pretty plain that Harris was all along suspended between “ faith ” and doubt, for it was not without difficulty that he was prevailed upon, when the translation was completed, to supply the necessary funds for defraying the printing expenses. To stimulate his flagging zeal, he was favoured, in March, 1830, with an alarming “ revelation,” which throws a singular light upon the footing on which Harris, the prophet, and, it would seem, the prophet’s wife, were with each other at this time. We give the more important passages :—

“ Behold, the mystery of Godliness, how great is it ? for, behold, I am endless, and the punishment which is given from my hand, is endless punishment, for endless is my name : wherefore—

Eternal punishment is God’s punishment.

Endless punishment is God’s punishment.

Wherefore I command you to repent, and keep the commandments which you have received by the hand of my servant Joseph Smith, jun., in my name ; and it is by my Almighty power that you have received them ; therefore I command you to repent—repent, lest I smite you by the rod of my mouth, and by my wrath, and by my anger, and your sufferings be sore—how sore you know not ! how exquisite you know not ! yea, how hard to bear you know not !

“ And again, I command thee that *thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife ; nor seek thy neighbour’s life*. And again, I command thee that *thou shalt not covet thine own property, but impart it freely to the printing of the Book of Mormon*, which contains the truth and the word of God, which is my word to the Gentile, that soon it may go to the Jew, of whom the Lamanites are a remnant, that they may believe the gospel, and look not for a Messiah to come who has already come. . .

“ Behold, this is a great and the last commandment which I shall give unto you concerning this matter ; for this shall suffice for thy daily walk, even unto the end of thy life. And misery thou shalt receive if thou wilt slight these counsels ; yea, even the destruction of thyself and property. *Impart a portion of thy property ; yea, even part of thy lands, and all save the support of thy family. Pay the debt thou hast contracted with the printer.* Release thyself from bondage. Leave thy house and home, except when thou shalt desire to see thy family ; and

“speak freely to all : yea, preach, exhort, declare the truth, even with a loud voice, with a sound of rejoicing, crying, Hosanna, hosanna! blessed be the name of the Lord God.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xliv. §§ 2, 3. 5.

This admonition produced the desired effect. Harris became both paymaster and witness for the Book of Mormon, and an elder of the Church. This, however, was only a beginning of what awaited him; for in August, 1831, when the settlement in Missouri had been determined on, and community of goods was made the law of the “Church,” we have the following revelation concerning him:—

“It is wisdom in me that my servant Martin Harris should be an example unto the Church, in laying his monies before the bishop of the Church. And also, this is a law unto every man that cometh unto this land, to receive an inheritance; and he shall do with his monies according as the law directs. And it is wisdom also, that there should be lands purchased in Independence, for the place of the store-house, and also for the house of the printing.

“And other directions concerning my servant Martin Harris shall be given him of the spirit, that he may receive his inheritance as seemeth him good. And let him repent of his sins for he seeketh the praise of the world.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xviii. §§ 7, 8.

So great was the ascendancy which Joseph possessed over the mind of Harris, that in spite of all his misgivings, and of all his losses and disappointments, he continued with him until the year 1837, when the failure of the “Safety Society Bank,” established by the prophet at Kirtland in Ohio, having swallowed up the remainder of his property, he returned in great disgust to Palmyra, and openly denounced Joseph as “a complete wretch.” But we must not anticipate.

Before we proceed with our history, it will be proper here to give a short account of the contents of the book which has made so much noise in the world, and of its probable origin. As regards its contents, it professes to be the history of the descendants of one Lehi of the tribe of Joseph, who emigrated from Jerusalem in the days of Zedekiah, with his four sons, one of whom, Nephi, was a great prophet. After many perils by land and by sea, they reached the continent of America, where they divided into two great families, the Nephites or white men, and the Lamanites or red men. Besides the history of these tribes of the ancient stock of Israel,—including an alleged descent of Christ upon the American Continent, after his ascension from Mount Olivet,—the

³ Caswall's *Prophet of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 129.

book contains a variety of prophetical matter. Nephi foretells, with astonishing minuteness, not only the coming of the Messiah, but the history of the Christian Church during the first four centuries. Another great prophet, Mormon by name, nearly a thousand years after Nephi, and four hundred years after Christ, acts the part of Ezra, by collecting the plates on which the records and documents of his race are engraved, and completing the golden Bible; which is deposited after his death by his son Moroni under the hill, where, 1427 years after, by direction of the Angel, it is found by Joseph Smith, in fulfilment of the Scripture prophecy, that "truth shall spring out of the earth".

With regard to the real origin of this book, we cannot do better than transcribe from the "Boston Weekly Messenger" of May 1st, 1839, the following document which, with remarkable simplicity and manifest truthfulness, tells its own tale:—

ORIGIN OF THE "BOOK OF MORMON," OR "GOLDEN BIBLE."

"As this book has excited much attention, and has been put by a certain new sect, in the place of the Sacred Scriptures, I deem it a duty which I owe to the public, to state what I know touching its origin. That its claims to a Divine origin are wholly unfounded, needs no proof to a mind unperturbed by the grossest delusions. That any sane person should rank it higher than any other merely human composition, is a matter of the greatest astonishment; yet it is received as Divine by some who dwell in enlightened New England, and even by those who have sustained the character of devoted Christians. Learning recently that Mormonism has found its way into a church in Massachusetts, and has impregnated some of its members with its gross delusions, so that excommunication has become necessary, I am determined to delay no longer doing what I can to strip the mask from this monster of sin, and to lay open this pit of abominations.

"Rev. Solomon Spaulding, to whom I was united in marriage in early life, was a graduate of Dartmouth College, and was distinguished for a lively imagination and a great fondness for history. At the time of our marriage, he resided in Cherry Valley, New York. From this place we removed to New Salem, Ashtabula county, Ohio; sometimes called Conneaut, as it is situated upon Conneaut Creek. Shortly after our removal to this place, his health sunk, and he was laid aside from active labours. In the town of New Salem, there are numerous mounds, and forts, supposed by many to be the dilapidated dwellings and fortifications of a race now extinct. These ancient relics arrest the attention of the new settlers, and become objects of research for the curious. Numerous implements were found, and other articles evincing great skill in the arts. Mr. Spaulding being an educated man, and pas-

* For fuller particulars we refer our readers to Caswall's Prophet of the Nineteenth Century, which, in an "Appendix," contains a copious epitome of the Book of Mormon.

sionately fond of history, took a lively interest in these developments of antiquity; and in order to beguile the hours of retirement, and furnish employment for his lively imagination, he conceived the idea of giving *an historical sketch of this long lost race*. Their extreme antiquity of course would lead him to write in *the most ancient style*, and as the Old Testament is the most ancient book in the world, he imitated its style as nearly as possible. His sole object in writing this *historical romance* was to amuse himself and his neighbours. This was about the year 1812. Hull's surrender at Detroit occurred near the same time, and I recollect the date well from that circumstance. As he progressed in his narrative, the neighbours would come in from time to time to hear portions read, and a great interest in the work was excited among them. It claimed to have been written by *one of the lost nation*, and to have been *recovered from the earth*, and assumed the title of 'Manuscript Found.' The neighbours would often inquire how Mr. S. progressed in deciphering 'the manuscript,' and when he had a sufficient portion prepared he would inform them, and they would assemble to hear it read. He was enabled, from his acquaintance with the classics and ancient history, to introduce *many singular names*, which were particularly noticed by the people, and could be easily recognized by them. Mr. Solomon Spaulding had a brother, Mr. John Spaulding, residing in the place at the time, who was perfectly familiar with this work, and repeatedly heard the whole of it read.

"From New Salem we removed to Pittsburgh, Pa. Here Mr. S. found an acquaintance and friend, in the person of Mr. Patterson, an editor of a newspaper. He exhibited his manuscript to Mr. P., who was very much pleased with it, and borrowed it for perusal. He retained it a long time, and informed Mr. S. that, if he would make out a title-page and preface, he would publish it, and it might be a source of profit. This Mr. S. refused to do, for reasons which I cannot now state. Sidney Rigdon, who has figured so largely in the history of the Mormons, was at this time connected with the printing-office of Mr. Patterson, as is well known in that region, and as Rigdon himself has frequently stated. Here he had ample opportunity to become acquainted with Mr. Spaulding's manuscript, and to copy it if he chose. It was a matter of notoriety and interest to all who were connected with the printing establishment. At length the manuscript was returned to its author, and soon after we removed to Amity, Washington county, Pa., where Mr. S. deceased in 1816. The manuscript then fell into my hands, and was carefully preserved. It has frequently been examined by my daughter, Mrs. Mc Kenstry, of Monson, Massachusetts, with whom I now reside, and by other friends. After the 'Book of Mormon' came out, a copy of it was taken to New Salem, the place of Mr. Spaulding's former residence, and the very place where the 'Manuscript Found' was written. A woman preacher appointed a meeting there, and in the meeting read and repeated copious extracts from the 'Book of Mormon.' The historical part was immediately recognized by all the older inhabitants, as the identical work of Mr. S.,

in which they had been so deeply interested years before. Mr. John Spaulding was present, who is an eminently pious man, and *recognized perfectly* the work of his brother. He was amazed and afflicted, that it should have been perverted to so wicked a purpose. His grief found vent in a flood of tears, and he arose on the spot and expressed in the meeting his deep sorrow and regret that the writings of his sainted brother should be used for a purpose so vile and shocking. The excitement in New Salem became so great, that the inhabitants had a meeting, and deputed Dr. Philastus Hurlbut, one of their number, to repair to this place, and to obtain from me the original manuscript of Mr. Spaulding, for the purpose of comparing it with the Mormon Bible, to satisfy their own minds and to prevent their friends from embracing an error so delusive. This was in the year 1834. Dr. Hurlbut brought with him an introduction and request for the manuscript, signed by Messrs. Henry Lake, Aaron Wright, and others, with all whom I was acquainted, as they were my neighbours when I resided in New Salem.

“I am sure that nothing could grieve my husband more, were he living, than the use which has been made of his work. The air of antiquity which was thrown about the composition, doubtless suggested the idea of converting it to purposes of delusion. Thus an historical romance, with the addition of a few pious expressions and extracts from the Sacred Scriptures, has been construed into a new Bible, and palmed off upon a company of poor deluded fanatics, as Divine. I have given the previous brief narration, that this work of deep deception and wickedness may be searched to the foundation, and its author exposed to the contempt and execration he so justly deserves.

“MATILDA DAVISON.

“Rev. Solomon Spaulding was the first husband of the narrator of the above history. Since his decease, she has been married to a second husband by the name of Davison. She is now residing in this place; is a woman of irreproachable character, and an humble Christian, and her testimony is worthy of implicit confidence.

“A. ELY, D.D., Pastor Cong. Church in Monson.

“D. R. AUSTIN, Principal of Monson Academy.

“*Monson, Mass., April 1st, 1839.*”

The story told by Mrs. Davison has since been the subject of careful investigation by other parties interested in unmasking the Mormonite imposture, and has not only been found correct, but has been confirmed by many circumstantial details, which those of our readers who may feel curious on the subject, will find briefly recorded in the second chapter of Mr. Caswall's “Prophet of the Nineteenth Century.” For our present purpose it suffices to have authenticated the quarter from which Joseph Smith derived the materials of a work, which he was by no means qualified by his education to compose. Nor can there

be much doubt left as to the medium through which the book found its way out of the printing-office at Pittsburg into the hands of Joseph Smith. There is a name mentioned in Mrs. Davison's narrative, which figures conspicuously, as we shall presently see, in the history of Mormonism; and the fact that the party in question, Sidney Rigdon, did not himself advance the forgery, but employed for this purpose Joseph Smith, a loose vagabond, whom his habits and occupation as a money-digger pointed out as a proper person for so audacious an attempt to impose upon the public, only proves the deep cunning with which the scheme was contrived. The pretended translation from behind the curtain, of which Martin Harris was made the dupe, was nothing more than a dictation of Spaulding's romance, with such alterations and embellishments as would suit the particular purpose which the two confederates—for such Sidney Rigdon and Joseph Smith doubtless were at this early period—had in view. The fact that the prediction of the discovery of the "golden plates," by a prophet in the latter days occurs in the "books of Nephi," substituted for the 116 pages which had been abstracted, is a critical circumstance. Joseph having interlarded Spaulding's manuscript with his predictions of himself in the character of a great prophet, could not venture to reproduce the same matter, as the least discrepancy between his first and second "translation" would have proved fatal to his whole device. Hence the delay of ten months, during which, in all probability, Smith was not only engaged in endeavouring to recover the lost manuscript, but in secret communication with Rigdon, as to the best way of extricating himself from the dilemma in which he found himself so unexpectedly placed.

The prophecy, itself, which points to Joseph Smith, jun., the Son of Joseph Smith, sen., the head of the Mormonite Sect, is to be found in the 2nd chapter of the 2nd Book of Nephi, and consists of a prediction said to have been uttered by Joseph, the Son of Israel, and recounted by Nephi to his youngest son, whose name was also Joseph. It runs thus:—

"Joseph truly testified, saying: A seer shall the Lord my God raise up, who shall be a choice seer unto the fruit of my loins. Yea, Joseph truly said, thus saith the Lord unto me: A choice seer will I raise up out of the fruit of thy loins; and he shall be esteemed highly among the fruit of thy loins. And unto him will I give commandment, that he shall do a work for the fruit of thy loins, his brethren, which shall be of great worth unto them, even to the bringing of them to the knowledge of the covenants which I have made with thy fathers. And I will give unto him a commandment, that he shall do none other work, save the work which I shall command him. And I will make him

great in mine eyes ; for he shall do my work. And he shall be great like unto Moses, whom I have said I would raise up unto you, to deliver my people, O house of Israel. And Moses will I raise up, to deliver thy people out of the land of Egypt. But a seer will I raise up out of the fruit of thy loins ; and unto him will I give power to bring forth my word unto the seed of thy loins ; and not to the bringing forth my word only, saith the Lord, but to the convincing them of my word, which shall have already gone forth among them. Wherefore, the fruit of thy loins shall write ; and the fruit of the loins of Judah shall write ; and that which shall be written by the fruit of thy loins, and also that which shall be written by the fruit of the loins of Judah, shall grow together, unto the confounding of false doctrines, and laying down of contentions, and establishing peace among the fruit of thy loins, and bringing them to the knowledge of their fathers in the latter days ; and also to the knowledge of my covenants, saith the Lord. And out of weakness he shall be made strong, in that day when my work shall commence among all my people, unto the restoring thee, O house of Israel, saith the Lord. And thus prophesied Joseph, saying : Behold, that seer will the Lord bless ; and they that seek to destroy him, shall be confounded ; for this promise, of which I have obtained of the Lord, of the fruit of my loins, shall be fulfilled. Behold, I am sure of the fulfilling of this promise. And his name shall be called after me ; and it shall be after the name of his father. And he shall be like unto me ; for the thing which the Lord shall bring forth by his hand, by the power of the Lord shall bring my people unto salvation ; yea, thus prophesied Joseph, I am sure of this thing, even as I am sure of the promise of Moses ; for the Lord hath said unto me, I will preserve thy seed for ever. And the Lord hath said, I will raise up a Moses ; and I will give power unto him in a rod ; and I will give judgment unto him in writing. Yet I will not loose his tongue, that he shall speak much ; for I will not make him mighty in speaking. But I will write unto him my law, by the finger of mine own hand ; and I will make a spokesman for him. And the Lord said unto me also, I will raise up unto the fruit of thy loins ; and I will make for him a spokesman. And I, behold, I will give unto him, that he shall write the writing of the fruit of thy loins, unto the fruit of thy loins ; and the spokesman of thy loins shall declare it. And the words which he shall write, shall be the words which are expedient in my wisdom should go forth unto the fruit of thy loins. And it shall be as if the fruit of thy loins had cried unto them from the dust ; for I know their faith. And they shall cry from the dust ; yea, even repentance unto thy brethren, even after many generations have gone by them. And it shall come to pass that their cry shall go, even according to the simpleness of their words. Because of their faith, their words shall proceed forth out of my mouth unto their brethren, who are the fruit of thy loins ; and the weakness of their words will I make strong in their faith, unto the remembering of my covenant which I made unto thy fathers."

The latter part of this "prophecy" seems to point to Sidney Rigdon, the position assigned to him in it tallying exactly with that which he occupied afterwards by "revelation" in the Church of Latter Day Saints. Further on, in the eleventh chapter of the same book, another prophecy is introduced, which bears directly upon the discovery and translation of the "Golden Bible" by the prophet Joseph:—

"But behold, I prophesy unto you concerning the last days; concerning the days when the Lord God shall bring these things forth unto the children of men. After my seed and the seed of my brethren shall have dwindled in unbelief, and shall have been smitten by the Gentiles; yea, after the Lord God shall have camped against them round about, and shall have laid siege against them with a mount, and raised forts against them; and after they shall have been brought down low in the dust, even that they are not, yet the words of the righteous shall be written, and the prayers of the faithful shall be heard, and all those who have dwindled in unbelief, shall not be forgotten; for those who shall be destroyed shall speak unto them out of the ground, and their speech shall be low out of the dust, and their voice shall be as one that hath a familiar spirit; for the Lord God will give unto him power, that he may whisper concerning them, even as it were out of the ground; and their speech shall whisper out of the dust. For thus saith the Lord God: They shall write the things which shall be done among them, and they shall be written and sealed up in a book, and those who have dwindled in unbelief, shall not have them, for they seek to destroy the things of God: wherefore, as those who have been destroyed, have been destroyed speedily; and the multitude of their terrible ones, shall be as chaff that passeth away. Yea, thus saith the Lord God: It shall be at an instant, suddenly."

The people upon whom this destruction fell, were the builders of the ancient cities, the ruins of which put the first idea of the old romance into the head of Spaulding; they are the "Nephites" of the fiction, whose records are upon the golden plates. After a sally against all the sects of Christendom, (among which the Church is of course not forgotten,) the "prophecy" thus proceeds:—

"And it shall come to pass, that the Lord God shall bring forth unto you the words of a book, and they shall be the words of them which have slumbered. And behold the book shall be sealed: and in the book shall be a revelation from God, from the beginning of the world to the ending thereof. Wherefore, because of the things which are sealed up, the things which are sealed shall not be delivered in the day of the wickedness and abominations of the people. Wherefore the book shall be kept from them. But the book shall be delivered unto a man, and he shall deliver the words of the book, which are the words of those who have slumbered in the dust; and he shall deliver these

words unto another; but the words which are sealed he shall not deliver, neither shall he deliver the book. For the book shall be sealed by the power of God, and the revelation which was sealed shall be kept in the book until the own due time of the Lord, that they may come forth: for behold, they reveal all things from the foundation of the world unto the end thereof. And the day cometh that the words of the book which were sealed shall be read upon the house-tops; and they shall be read by the power of Christ: and all things shall be revealed unto the children of men which ever have been among the children of men, and which ever will be, even unto the end of the earth. Wherefore, at that day when the book shall be delivered unto the man of whom I have spoken, the book shall be hid from the eyes of the world, that the eyes of none shall behold it, save it be that three witnesses shall behold it, by the power of God, besides him to whom the book shall be delivered; and they shall testify to the truth of the book and the things therein. And there is none other which shall view it, save it be a few, according to the will of God, to bear testimony of his word unto the children of men: for the Lord God hath said, that the words of the faithful should speak as if it were from the dead. Wherefore, the Lord God will proceed to bring forth the words of the book; and in the mouth of as many witnesses as seemeth him good, will he establish his word; and wo be unto him that rejecteth the word of God."

A similar prophecy is placed on record by Moroni, the son of Mormon, in the fourth chapter of that portion of the whole collection called the "Book of Mormon," to which the title "The Book of Mormon" specially belongs.

"I am the son of Mormon, and my father was a descendant of Nephi; and I am the same who hideth up this record unto the Lord; the plates thereof are of no worth, because of the commandment of the Lord. For he truly saith, that no one shall have them to get gain; but the record thereof is of great worth; and whoso shall bring it to light, him will the Lord bless, For none can have power to bring it to light, save it be given him of God; for God will that it shall be done with an eye single to his glory, or the welfare of the ancient and long dispersed covenant people of the Lord. And blessed be him that shall bring this thing to light; for it shall be brought out of darkness unto light, according to the word of God; yea, it shall be brought out of the earth, and it shall shine forth out of darkness, and come unto the knowledge of the people; and it shall be done by the power of God; and if there be faults, they be the faults of a man. But behold, we know no fault. Nevertheless, God knoweth all things; therefore he that condemneth, let him be aware lest he shall be in danger of hell-fire. And he that sayeth, show unto me, or ye shall be smitten, let him beware lest he commandeth that which is forbidden of the Lord."

To these "prophecies" we shall add one more extract from

the twelfth chapter of the second book of Nephi, which defines the position assigned to the "Book of Mormon" relative to the Holy Scriptures.

"Behold, there shall be many at that day, when I shall proceed to do a marvellous work among them, that I may remember my covenants which I have made unto the children of men, that I may set my hand again the second time to recover my people, which are of the house of Israel; and also, that I may remember the promises which I have made unto thee, Nephi, and also unto thy father, that I would remember your seed; and that the words of your seed should proceed forth out of my mouth unto your seed. And my words shall hiss forth unto the ends of the earth, for a standard unto my people, which are of the house of Israel. And because my words shall hiss forth, many of the Gentiles shall say, a Bible, a Bible, we have got a Bible, and there cannot be any more Bible. But, thus saith the Lord God: O fools, they shall have a Bible; and it shall proceed forth from the Jews, mine ancient covenant people. And what thank they the Jews for the Bible which they receive from them? Yea, what do the Gentiles mean? Do they remember the travels, and the labours, and the pains of the Jews, and their diligence unto me, in bringing forth salvation unto the Gentiles?

"O ye Gentiles, have ye remembered the Jews, mine ancient covenant people? nay, but ye have cursed them, and have hated them, and have not sought to recover them. But behold, I will return all these things upon your own heads: for I the Lord, hath not forgotten my people. Thou fool, that shall say, a Bible, we have got a Bible, and we need no more Bible. Have ye obtained a Bible, save it were by the Jews? Know ye not that there are more nations than one? Know ye not that I the Lord your God, have created all men, and that I remember those who are upon the isles of the sea; and that I rule in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath; and I bring forth my word unto the children of men, yea, even upon all the nations of the earth? Wherefore murmur ye, because that ye shall receive more of my word? Know ye not that the testimony of two nations is a witness unto you that I am God, that I remember one nation like unto another? Wherefore, I speak the same words unto one nation like unto another. And when the two nations shall run together, the testimony of the two nations shall run together also. And I do this that I may prove unto many, that I am the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and that I speak forth my words according to mine own pleasure. And because that I have spoken one word, ye need not suppose that I cannot speak another; for my work is not yet finished; neither shall it be, until the end of man; neither from that time henceforth and for ever.

"Wherefore, because that ye have a Bible, ye need not suppose that it contains all my words; neither need ye suppose that I have not caused more to be written: for I command all men, both in the east, and in the west, and in the north, and in the south, and in the islands of the

sea, that they shall write the words which I speak unto them : for out of the books which shall be written, I will judge the world, every man according to their works, according to that which is written. For, behold, I shall speak unto the Jews, and they shall write it ; and I shall also speak unto the Nephites, and they shall write it ; and I shall also speak unto the other tribes of the house of Israel, which I have led away, and they shall write it ; and I shall also speak unto all nations of the earth, and they shall write it.

“ And it shall come to pass that the Jews shall have the words of the Nephites, and the Nephites shall have the words of the Jews ; and the Nephites and the Jews shall have the words of the lost tribes of Israel ; and the lost tribes of Israel shall have the words of the Nephites and the Jews.

“ And it shall come to pass that my people which are of the house of Israel, shall be gathered home unto the lands of their possessions ; and my word also shall be gathered in one ⁵. And I will show unto them that fight against my word and against my people, who are of the house of Israel, that I am God, and that I covenanted with Abraham that I would remember his seed for ever.”

We now resume the thread of our history. The translation from the “ Golden Plates,” or the “ Book of Mormon,” being at last completed, and printed at the expense of Martin Harris, the prophet deemed that the time was now come for organizing a “ Church.” As far back as June, 1829, a “ revelation ” had been “ given to Joseph Smith, jun., Oliver Cowdery, and David Whitmer,” directing them to look out twelve men fit to be chosen as apostles, and announcing other measures preparatory to the “ building up the Church of Christ, according to the fulness of the gospel.” Another “ revelation ” to the same purpose, followed in April of the following year :

“ The rise of the Church of Christ in these last days, being one thousand eight hundred and thirty years since the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the flesh, it being regularly organized and established *agreeably to the laws of our country*, by the will and commandments of God, in the fourth month, and on the sixth day of the month which is called April ; which commandments were given to Joseph Smith, jun., who was called of God, and ordained an apostle of Jesus Christ, to be the first elder of this church : and to Oliver Cowdery, who was also called of God, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to be the second elder of this church, and ordained under his hand ; and this according to the grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be all glory, both now and for ever. Amen.

⁵ In like manner Christ is made to say, in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, “ The Book of Mormon and the Holy Scriptures are given of me for your instruction.”—Sect. lv. § 3.

“After it was truly manifested unto this first elder that he had received a remission of his sins, he was entangled again in the vanities of the world; but after repenting, and humbling himself sincerely, through faith, God ministered unto him by an holy angel, whose countenance was as lightning, and whose garments were pure and white above all other whiteness; and gave unto him commandments which inspired him; and gave him power from on high, by the means which were before prepared, to translate the Book of Mormon, which contains a record of a fallen people, and the fulness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles and to the Jews also, which was given by inspiration, and is confirmed to others by the ministering of angels, and is declared unto the world by them, proving to the world that the Holy Scriptures are true, and that God does inspire men and call them to his holy work in this age and generation, as well as in generations of old, thereby showing that he is the same God yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Amen.

“Therefore, having so great witnesses, by them shall the world be judged, even as many as shall hereafter come to a knowledge of this work; and those who receive it in faith, and work righteousness, shall receive a crown of eternal life; but those who harden their hearts in unbelief, and reject it, it shall turn to their own condemnation, for the Lord God has spoken it; and we, the elders of the church, have heard and bear witness to the words of the glorious Majesty on high, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. ii. §§ 1—3.

Then follows a short account, after Joseph's own manner, of the creation, the fall, the Old Testament, the coming of Christ, and the Christian dispensation, ending with the appointment of baptism, as the means of entrance into the Mormon “Church.” After this, we have an outline of the constitution of the “Church,” of the functions of her several ministers and members, and of the sacraments and ordinances. Baptism is to be ministered by immersion, but only to those who have reached the age of “accountability,” which is fixed at eight years⁶. A difficulty having arisen from the wish of some persons to join the Church, who were, nevertheless, unwilling to be rebaptized, the question was settled by a special “revelation,” which declared that

“Although a man should be baptized a hundred times, it availeth him nothing, for you cannot enter in at the strait gate by the law of Moses, neither by your dead works,”

and commanded them to—

“Enter in at the gate, as I have commanded, and seek not to counsel your god.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xlvii.

⁶ *Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxii. § 4.

A special form is given for the administration of the Lord's Supper, but this is subsequently modified by a "revelation" which declares the use of the proper elements of the sacrament to be immaterial :

"Behold, I say unto you, that *it mattereth not what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, when ye partake of the sacrament*, if it so be that ye do it with an eye single to my glory; remembering unto the Father my body which was laid down for you, and my blood which was shed for the remission of your sins: wherefore, a commandment I give unto you, that you shall not purchase wine, neither strong drink of your enemies: wherefore, you shall partake of none, except it is made new among you; yea, in this my Father's kingdom which shall be built upon the earth."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. 1. § 1.

The Church being constituted—at Manchester, State of New York—the prophet next had a "revelation," appointing himself to the prophetic office, and providing for his own ordination by one of the three witnesses :

"Behold there shall be a record kept among you, and in it *thou shalt be called a seer, a translator, a prophet, an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder of the church through the will of God the Father, and the grace of your Lord Jesus Christ, being inspired of the Holy Ghost to lay the foundation thereof, and to build it up unto the most holy faith*, which church was organized and established in the year of your Lord eighteen hundred and thirty, in the fourth month, and on the sixth day of the month, which is called April.

"Wherefore, *meaning the church, thou shalt give heed unto all his words and commandments, which he shall give unto you as he receiveth them*, walking in all holiness before me; for *his word ye shall receive, as if from mine own mouth*, in all patience and faith; for by doing these things the gates of hell shall not prevail against you; yea, and the Lord God will disperse the powers of darkness from before you, and cause the heavens to shake for your good, and his name's glory. For thus saith the Lord God, him have I inspired to move the cause of Zion in mighty power for good, and his diligence I know, and his prayers I have heard, yea, his weeping for Zion I have seen, and I will cause that he shall mourn for her no longer, for his days of rejoicing are come unto the remission of his sins, and the manifestations of my blessings upon his works.

"For, behold, I will bless all those who labour in my vineyard with a mighty blessing, and *they shall believe on his words, which are given him through me by the Comforter*, which manifesteth that Jesus was crucified by sinful men for the sins of the world, yea, for the remission of sins unto the contrite heart. Wherefore, *it behoveth me that he should be ordained by you, Oliver Cowdery, mine apostle*: this being an ordinance unto you, that *you are an elder under his hand, he being the first unto you*, that you might be an elder unto this church of Christ, bearing my

name, and the first preacher of this church unto the church, and before the world, yea, before the Gentiles; yea, and thus saith the Lord God, lo, lo! to the Jews also. Amen."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xlvi.

Another "revelation" shortly after made provision for the temporal necessities of the prophet, while confirming his alleged inspiration:—

"Magnify thine office; and after thou hast sowed thy fields and secured them, go speedily unto the church which is in Colesville, Fayette, and Manchester, and *they shall support thee*; and I will bless them both spiritually and temporally; but if they receive thee not, I will send upon them a cursing instead of a blessing.

"And thou shalt continue in calling upon God in my name, and writing the things which shall be given thee by the Comforter, and expounding all scriptures unto the church; and it shall be given thee in the very moment what thou shalt speak and write, and they shall hear it, or I will send unto them a cursing instead of a blessing."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. ix. § 2, 3.

And in September of the same year, 1830, a special "revelation" became necessary to repress rival claims to prophetic gifts. One Hiram Page, one of the eight witnesses, was instructed that "those things which he had written from that stone," were not of God, but that "Satan was deceiving him;" and to apostle Oliver himself, the wide distinction between himself and the prophet had to be pointed out:—

"Behold, verily, verily, I say unto thee, no one shall be appointed to receive commandments and revelations in this Church, excepting my servant Joseph Smith, jun., for he receiveth them even as Moses; and thou shalt be obedient unto the things which I shall give unto him, even as Aaron, to declare faithfully the commandments and the revelations, with power and authority unto the Church. And if thou art led at any time by the Comforter, to speak or teach, or at all times by the way of commandment unto the Church, thou mayest do it. But thou shalt not write by way of commandment, but by wisdom: and thou shalt not command him who is at thy head, and at the head of the Church, for I have given him the keys of the mysteries, and the revelations which are sealed, until I shall appoint unto them another in his stead."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. li. § 2.

It would be an endless task to adduce the various "revelations" which now succeeded each other, all having for their object to enforce the prophet's behests in the Church, to consolidate his authority, to repress the claims of his accomplices in the fraud to a share of his power, and to dispose of intractable Church-officers by sending them forth on missionary excursions.

While the "Church" continued in Manchester and its vicinity, under the sole control of Joseph, he contrived to maintain his authority tolerably well. But a mighty change took place when, at the end of 1830, Sidney Rigdon's joint-authority was brought into play. His introduction to the Church was most skilfully managed by means of a mission to Kirtland, Ohio, where Rigdon was presiding over a congregation of Campbellite Baptists. On the new doctrine of the Book of Mormon being preached to them, a number of the Campbellites, and among them Rigdon himself, were converted, and received baptism at the hands of Joseph's emissaries. This was followed by a visit from Rigdon to the "Church" at Manchester, when this "revelation" was "given to Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon," in December, 1830 :—

"Behold, verily, verily, I say unto my servant Sidney, I have looked upon thee and thy works. I have heard thy prayers, and prepared thee for a greater work. Thou art blessed, for thou shalt do great things. Behold thou wast sent forth, even as John, to prepare the way before me, and before Elijah which should come, and thou knewest it not. Thou didst baptize by water unto repentance, but they received not the Holy Ghost; but now I give unto thee a commandment, that thou shalt baptize by water, and they shall receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of thy hands, even as the apostles of old." —*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xi. § 2.

Soon after this, at the beginning of the year 1831, the headquarters of the "Church" were removed to Kirtland, and from this time forward the "revelations" assume a fuller and more ambitious character, which evidently bespeaks the influence of a thorough man of business, more highly educated, and more deeply versed in the Scriptures than Joseph. One Edward Partridge, a creature of Rigdon's, who had come with him from Kirtland to Manchester, and returned thither in his and Joseph's company, was by "revelation" appointed "Bishop;" an office which had regard rather to the ecclesiastical government of the "Church," and the management of her temporalities, than to spiritual oversight, and which rendered him at times very obnoxious to Smith, as several of the "revelations" testify. With Rigdon, too, there appears to have been sharp conflicts, which were composed on one occasion by a "revelation," dividing the blame between them⁷. Rigdon, however, soon attained to an equality of power with the prophet, and one of the visions, which sets forth the three states, the celestial, terrestrial, and telestial, runs in their joint names⁸. At one time Joseph Smith and

⁷ *Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. lxxxiii. §§ 7, 8.

⁸ *Ibid.* Sect. xcii. § 3.

Sidney Rigdon saw fit to send away all the elders from the "Church," on different missions, "two and two," that they should "teach the principles of the gospel, which are in the Bible and in the Book of Mormon, in the which is the fulness of the gospel," with a special injunction to "observe the covenants and church articles to do them." And all this they are bidden to

"Observe to do as I have commanded concerning your teaching, until the fulness of my scriptures are (*sic!*) given⁹."

The expression, the "fulness of my scriptures," has reference to a new translation of the Bible which had been taken in hand, probably as the suggestion of Rigdon, but the execution of which, except the publication of a few fragments, was apparently prevented by subsequent occurrences and by the want of funds.

On the 17th of February, 1834, the "Church" which had been going on increasing was finally "organized by revelation," when Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and R. G. Williams were acknowledged presidents. A council was appointed to assist them in the administration of its affairs, and a regular staff of resident and travelling officers, whose respective duties and relative positions were accurately defined¹. A costly temple was erected, as well as private residences for Smith and Rigdon, who having possessed themselves of the surplus wealth of their converts, launched out into a multiplicity of enterprises, and among others established a "Safety Society Bank," which proved eventually the ruin of the Mormon cause in the State of Ohio. Of these transactions few traces are to be found in the "revelations" given at this period; the history of them is chiefly derived from the opponents of the Mormons; and as it lies out of the way of our more immediate object, we shall refer our readers once more to Mr. Caswall's book for information².

Long, however, before the removal of the "Saints" from Kirtland became a matter of necessity, in consequence of the failure of the bank, under circumstances of great disgrace, a scheme had been formed for the establishment of a much larger settlement than any this sect had as yet had, Farther West. As early as June, 1831, a "revelation" was given, pointing to certain land in Missouri, as land "to be consecrated to the Lord's people."

"If ye are faithful, ye shall assemble yourselves together to rejoice upon the land of Missouri, which is *the land of your inheritance*, which

⁹ Covenants and Commandments, Sect. xiii. § 2, 5.

¹ Ibid. Sect. v.

² Prophet of the Nineteenth Century, chap. vii. vii.

is near the land of your enemies. But, behold, I the Lord will hasten the city in its time, and will crown the faithful with joy and with rejoicings."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. lxvi. § 9.

An assembly of elders was convened, on the ground which it was intended hereafter to occupy, and which was now declared to be the proper location for the city of Zion, and the great temple that should be built³. At this time,—August 1831,—the idea of acquiring the land otherwise than by purchase, though probably broached, received no countenance :—

"Behold, this is the will of the Lord your God concerning his Saints, that they should assemble themselves together unto the land of Zion, not in haste, lest there should be confusion, which bringeth pestilence. Behold, the land of Zion, I, the Lord, holdeth it in mine own hands; nevertheless, I the Lord, rendereth unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's : wherefore, I, the Lord, willeth that you should purchase the lands that you may have advantage of the world, that you may have claim on the world, that they may not be stirred up unto anger; for Satan putteth it into their hearts to anger against you, and to the shedding of blood; wherefore the land of Zion shall not be obtained but by purchase or by blood, otherwise there is none inheritance for you. And if by purchase, behold you are blessed; and if by blood, as you are forbidden to shed blood, lo, your enemies are upon you, and ye shall be scourged from city to city, and from synagogue to synagogue, and but few shall stand to receive an inheritance."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xx. § 8.

In the following year, 1832, a formal promise of the restoration of Zion, the erection of the New Jerusalem in Missouri, was given by "revelation :"—

"A revelation of Jesus Christ unto his servant Joseph Smith, jun., and six elders, as they united their hearts and lifted their voices on high; yea, the word of the Lord concerning his Church, established in the last days for the restoration of his people, as He has spoken by the mouth of his prophets, and for the gathering of his saints to stand upon mount Zion, which shall be the city New Jerusalem, which city shall be built, beginning at the temple lot, which is appointed by the finger of the Lord, in the western boundaries of the state of Missouri, and dedicated by the hand of Joseph Smith, jun., and others with whom the Lord was well pleased.

"Verily this is the word of the Lord, that the city New Jerusalem shall be built by the gathering of the saints beginning at this place, even the place of the temple, which temple shall be reared in this generation; for verily, this generation shall not all pass away until an house shall be built unto the Lord, and a cloud shall rest upon it,

³ *Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xxvii. § 1.

which cloud shall be even the glory of the Lord, which shall fill the house.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. iv. § 1, 2.

And in the month of December, 1833, a commandment went forth for a general gathering in all the churches in every part of the world, in order to collect funds for “the redemption of Zion⁴.”

How far the investments in Missouri may have helped to embarrass the finances of the “Church” at Kirtland, it is impossible to say. The probability, however, is, that they had no small share in the catastrophe which eventually accelerated the transfer of the centre of Mormonism to the spot prophetically pointed out as the place in which the New Jerusalem should be erected. And certain it is that the most stringent measures were taken to levy contributions upon the members of the Church, by a system of enforced donations, which had much more the character of confiscation than of taxation. The principle of complete surrender of private property was laid down broadly, soon after the removal to Kirtland, in the first instance under the guise of securing support for the poor, but in reality for enriching the Church, and placing all the property of the members at the disposal of the leaders.

“If thou lovest me, thou shalt serve me and keep all my commandments. And behold, thou wilt remember the poor, and consecrate of thy properties for their support that which thou hast to impart unto them *with a covenant and a deed which cannot be broken*; and inasmuch as ye impart of your substance unto the poor, ye will do it unto me, and they shall be laid before the bishop of my church and his counsellors, two of the elders, or high priests, such as he shall or has appointed and set apart for that purpose.

“And it shall come to pass, that *after they are laid before the bishop of my church, and after that he has received these testimonies concerning the consecration of the properties of my church, that they cannot be taken from the church agreeably to my commandments*; every man shall be made accountable unto me, a steward over his own property, or that which he has received by consecration, inasmuch as is sufficient for himself and family.

“And again, *if there shall be properties in the hands of the church, or any individuals of it, more than is necessary for their support, after this first consecration, which is a residue to be consecrated unto the bishop, it shall be kept to administer to those who have not*, from time to time, that every man who has need may be amply supplied, and receive according to his wants. Therefore, *the residue shall be kept in my store-house, to administer to the poor and the needy, as shall be appointed by the high council of the church, and the bishop and his council, and for the purpose of purchasing lands for the public benefit of the church, and build-*

⁴ *Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xcv. §§ 9, 10.

ing houses of worship, and building up of the New Jerusalem which hereafter to be revealed, that my covenant people may be gathered one in that day when I shall come to my temple. And this I do for the salvation of my people.

“And it shall come to pass, that he that sinneth and repenteth not, shall be cast out of the church, and shall not receive again that which he has consecrated unto the poor and the needy of my church; or in other words, unto me; for inasmuch as ye do it unto the least of these, ye do it unto me; for it shall come to pass, that which I spake by the mouths of my prophets, shall be fulfilled; for I will consecrate of the riches of those who embrace my gospel among the Gentiles, unto the poor of my people who are of the house of Israel. . . .”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. xiii. §§ 8—11.

However unpalatable this system might prove, and undoubtedly did prove, to many of the members, and especially the new comers, it was constantly enforced by “revelations,” and carried out with greater rigour than ever, after the removal from Kirtland, as appears from a “revelation” given at Far West, Missouri, July 8, 1838, in answer to the question, “O Lord, show unto Thy servants how much thou requirest of the properties of thy people for a tithing.” The answer is as follows:—

“Verily, thus saith the Lord, I require all their surplus property to put into the hands of the bishop of my church of Zion, for the building of mine house, and for the laying the foundation of Zion and for the priesthood, and for the debts of the presidency of my church; and this shall be the beginning of the tithing of my people; and after that, those who have thus been tithed, shall pay one-tenth of all their interest annually, and this shall be a standing law unto them for ever, for my holy priesthood, saith the Lord.

“Verily I say unto you, it shall come to pass, that all those who gather unto the land of Zion shall be tithed of their surplus properties, and shall observe this law, or they shall not be found worthy to abide among you. And I say unto you, if my people observe not this law, to keep it holy, and by this law sanctify the land of Zion unto me, that my statutes and my judgments may be kept thereon, that it may be most holy; behold, verily I say unto you, it shall not be a land of Zion unto you; and this shall be an ensample unto all the stakes of Zion. Even so. Amen.”—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. cvii.

The settlement of Zion, however, notwithstanding the most confident predictions, and the most positive and explicit “revelations,” proved an utter failure. One short year was sufficient to provoke the Missourians to a war of extermination against the sect, which ended in its expulsion from the State⁵, and its

⁵ For an account of the wars between the Missourians and the Mormonites, see Caswall, *The Prophet of the Nineteenth Century*, ch. ix. x.

removal to the State of Illinois, where, on the banks of the Mississippi, the foundations of the famous city of Nauvoo were laid in 1839. To avoid the confession of failure, the prophet boldly asserted, that notwithstanding all that had passed, Independence in Jackson County, Missouri, was the place where Zion should be built; but in the mean time, Nauvoo, "the beautiful city," was to be their principal "stake," until "the time of the Gentiles should be fulfilled." No one could suspect the straits to which the sect had been reduced, the sufferings which its members had undergone, or the damage which the character of the prophet had sustained, from the tone of gratulation and of triumph, and of arrogated supremacy over all the nations and kingdoms of the earth, which pervades the "revelation" given at Nauvoo in January, 1841:—

"I say unto you, that you are now called immediately to make a solemn proclamation of my gospel, and of this stake which I have planted to be a corner-stone of Zion, which shall be polished with that refinement which is after the similitude of a palace. This proclamation shall be made to all the kings of the world—to the four corners thereof—to the honourable president elect, and the high-minded governors of the nation in which you live, and to all the nations of the earth scattered abroad. Let it be written in the spirit of meekness, and by the power of the Holy Ghost which shall be in you at the time of the writing of the same; for it shall be given you by the Holy Ghost to know my will concerning those kings and authorities, even what shall befall them in a time to come. For, behold, I am about to call upon them to give heed to the light and glory of Zion, for the set time has come to favour her."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. ciii. § 1.

At Nauvoo the wickedness of the Mormon system reached its climax. Flushed by his success, after the most fearful reverses, the prophet now overleapt all the bonds of self-restraint, and in more than one sense carried himself as the Mahomet of the West. A full, and to all appearance authentic, account of the state of affairs at Nauvoo⁶, and of the private as well as public conduct of Joseph Smith at this period, is given by one whose testimony it is hardly possible for a follower of the prophet to repudiate, considering the reception which was given him, the estimation in which he was for a long time held by the prophet, and the position which he occupied at Nauvoo, where he continued to live as a Mormonite, for the space of eighteen months, holding, during the greater part of that time, a high station in the sect, which gave him admission to all its mysteries, and a knowledge of all its secrets;—we allude to General J. C. Bennett, whose "*Exposé of Joe Smith and of Mormonism*" is quoted

⁶ See also Caswall's *City of the Mormons; or, Three Days at Nauvoo in 1842*.

(No. 3) at the head of this article. According to John Bennett's own account he never was a believer in Mormonism, but having reasons to suspect the Mormon leader of "a daring and colossal scheme of rebellion and usurpation throughout the Northwestern States," having in fact documents to show a scheme for conquering Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri; and creating a despotic military and religious empire, with Joe Smith at the head, he determined to spy out the land, and for this purpose feigned himself a convert to Mormonism. However questionable the morality of this proceeding may be⁷, certain it is that the inspiration of Joseph did not serve him to discern the traitor in the camp. So far from discovering Bennett's real intentions, Joseph distinguished him by "revelation," as a valuable accession to the staff of the Church.

"Let my servant, John C. Bennett, help you in your labour in sending my word to the kings of the people of the earth, and stand by you, even you my servant Joseph Smith, in the hour of affliction, and his reward shall not fail if he receive counsel; and for his love he shall be great, for he shall be mine if he do this, saith the Lord. I have seen the work which he hath done, which I accept, if he continue, and will crown him with blessings and great glory."—*Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. ciii. § 6.

Such a "revelation" in the standard book of the sect, the record of the prophet's "inspired" utterance, bestowed upon a man who himself openly declares that he never was any thing but a spy and a traitor among the "saints," is the most conclusive evidence, if any were needed, that Joseph Smith has no pretensions whatever to be accounted a prophet. The mistake which he made in pronouncing Mr. Caswall's manuscript of the Greek Testament a dictionary of Egyptian hieroglyphics⁸, is a mere trifle compared with the moral mistake of his reposing, and that professedly while under the influence of inspiration, the greatest confidence in an individual who was in fact at that very moment planning his destruction. Nor was this want of discernment confined to the one instance of the "revelation" quoted above; Bennett had not been much more than six months in Nauvoo, where Smith was then omnipotent, before he combined, in his person, the offices of Mayor of the City, Major-General of the Nauvoo Legion, and

⁷ Bennett himself offers a kind of apology for it. "Persons unacquainted," he says, "with the subject can scarcely imagine the baseness and turpitude of Mormon principles, or the horrid practices to which these principles gave rise. When they learn how habitually the Mormons sacrifice to their brutal propensities the virtue and happiness of young and innocent females; how they cruelly persecute those who refuse to join them, and how they murder those who attempt to expose them; they will look with indulgence upon almost any means employed to thwart their villanous designs, and detect and disclose their infamy."

⁸ Caswall's *History of the Mormons*, pp. 35—37.

First President of the Church of the Latter Day Saints ; and it is worthy of remark, that when he determined to leave Nauvoo, he withdrew with the full knowledge and consent of Joseph, and received a vote of thanks from the City Council. All these circumstances, as well as his standing in society, which is attested by a number of testimonials of the first respectability, impart a degree of credibility, and an air of authenticity, to the report of General Bennett, to which few of the other opponents of Mormonism can lay claim.

Having, then, made our readers acquainted with the history and character of our witness, we now proceed briefly to sum up the most important points of his evidence. According to General Bennett's statement, the whole community at Nauvoo was nothing more than a huge organization for the gratification of the rapacity, the lust and lawless ambition of Joseph Smith and his associates. While these were accommodated with comfortable quarters at the public expense, and lived in ease and comparative luxury, their deluded followers were exposed to every species of privation. This Bennett states, both upon his own authority, and upon that of others whose evidence he quotes ; and, in illustration of the spirit in which the prophet acted, he adduces the following anecdote :

“ At the very time that the elders of this Church, and indeed the poorer class, were suffering from the want of the common necessities of life, Smith demanded, at the hands of the people, 1200 dollars per year, in order to aggrandize himself and enable him to live in luxury. And when some complained that this would be a violation of the rules of the Church, he remarked, that if he could not obtain his demand, his people might go to h—, and he would go to the Rocky Mountains.”
—*Bennett's History of the Saints*, p. 60.

While the general multitude of believers in Mormonism were thus left to toil and to starve, being deprived of their property by “ revelations,” under the plea of its being devoted to the service of the Most High, there was an extensive organization, under the name of the Order Lodge, to which those who were thought worthy of it, were initiated by the most ridiculous, profane, and indecent mysteries⁹. Among the ceremonies which took place at these secret rites, was a blasphemous personation of the Holy Trinity, in which, in General Bennett's time, God the Father was represented by Joseph, God the Son by his brother Hyrum Smith,

⁹ The account given by Bennett of this Order Lodge is confirmed by a curious Tract, republished by Arthur Hall (London), entitled, “ Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Dispersion of the Mormons. By John Thomas, M.D., Author of ‘ Elpin Israel,’ Virginia, U. S. of America : to which is added, *An Account of the Nauvoo Temple Mysteries, and other Abominations, practised by the Mormons previous to their Emigration for California.* By Increase M'Gee Van Dusen, formerly one of the Initiated.”

and God the Holy Ghost by one George Miller. One of the most horrible features of this secret organization was the spiritual seraglio, formed for the gratification of the profligate propensities of the prophet, and of the other leaders of the sect. We cannot pollute our pages with any of the details given by General Bennett; suffice it to say, that a regular course of initiation took place, of both married and unmarried females, through three degrees, or orders, that of the "Cyprian Saints," or the "Saints of the White Veil,"—that of "Chambered Sisters of Charity," or "Saints of the Green Veil,"—and, lastly, that of "Oloistered Saints," "Consecratees of the Oloister," or "Saints of the Black Veil;" the adepts of the last and highest degree in this ascending scale of corruption, being exempted from any restraint, and living in the indulgence of the grossest debauchery with the leaders of the sect, and especially with the prophet himself, who in this select circle assumed the familiar *sobriquet* of the "Old White Hat."

Another and most frightful part of this secret organization was the body of desperadoes, incorporated originally at Zion, in Missouri, under the mysterious name of the "daughter of Zion," otherwise called the "Danites;" men who were solemnly bound under a fearful oath, and under the penalty of instant and certain death, to execute the decrees of the leaders, and especially of the prophet himself, whatever they might be: robbery, perjury, murder, or whatever other crime it was desirable to commit, in furtherance of the interests of the ruling body, these "Danites" were ready to execute. At the time of General Bennett's sojourn at Nauvoo, their number was 1200, and out of them the twelve most desperate characters were selected, and distinguished by the appellation, the "destroying angels," or, less obviously to the uninitiated, the "flying angels." Most daring assassinations, at great distances, as well as at the Mormon city itself, were planned and carried into effect; among them that of Governor Boggs of Missouri, whose violent death Smith had the audacity to predict. Bennett himself was in no small danger from these emissaries of death, after his separation from the sect; but being thoroughly aware of the system, he was on his guard and managed to escape:—

"Nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of all the *faithful*," says General Bennett, "of the Mormon Church, regard Joe Smith as God's vicegerent on earth, and obey him accordingly; and all the Danites of that Church (and, by the bye, they compose no very inconsiderable proportion of their mighty hosts), are sworn to receive him as the supreme lord of the Church, and to obey him as the supreme God. If, therefore, any state officer, in the administration of public justice, happens to give offence to his Holiness the Prophet, it becomes the

will of God, *as spoken by the mouth of his prophet*, that that functionary should die; and his followers, *the faithful saints*, immediately set about the work of assassination, in obedience, as they suppose, to their Divine master; and for which NOBLE DEED they expect to receive an excellent and superior glory in the celestial kingdom”

“The standard of morality and Christian excellence with them is quite unstable. Joe Smith has but to give the *word*, and it becomes the LAW *which they delight to obey*—BECAUSE IT COMES FROM GOD!!! Acts, therefore, which but yesterday were considered the most immoral, wicked, and devilish—to-day are the most moral, righteous, and God-like; because God, who makes right, has so declared it *by the mouth of his anointed prophet*.”—*Bennett's History of the Saints*, pp. 148, 149.

Although, after all that has been stated respecting the character and career of the founder of Mormonism, it is impossible that he should be regarded in any other light than that of a daring impostor, yet the following anecdotes are not without interest, as showing the tone of his mind.

“One day, Joe, the prophet, was gravely dictating to George Robinson a revelation which he had just received from the Lord. Robinson, according to custom, wrote down the very words the Lord spake to Joe, and in the exact order in which the latter heard them. He had written for some considerable time, when Smith's inspiration began to flag; and to gain breath, he requested Robinson to read over what he had written. He did so, until he came to a particular passage, when Smith interrupted him, and desired to have that read again. Robinson complied; and Smith, shaking his head, knitting his brows, and looking very much perplexed, said—‘That will never do! you must alter that, George.’ Robinson, though not a little surprised at “*the Lord's blunder*,” did as he was directed, and changed the offensive passage into one more fit for the inspection of the Gentiles.”—*Bennett's History of the Saints*, p. 176.

Upon another occasion:

“As General Bennett and Smith were walking together on the banks of the Mississippi, Smith suddenly said to him, in a peculiarly inquiring manner: ‘General, Harris says that you have no faith, and that you do not believe we shall ever obtain our inheritances in Jackson County, Missouri.’ Though somewhat perplexed by the prophet's remark, and still more by his manner, Bennett coldly replied: ‘What does Harris know about my belief, or the real state of my mind? I like to tease him now and then about it, as he is so firm in the faith, and takes it all in such good part.’ ‘Well,’ said Joe, laughing heartily, ‘I guess you have got about as much faith as I have. Ha! ha! ha!’ ‘I should judge about as much,’ was Bennett's reply.”—*Bennett's History of the Saints*, p. 176.

It is no wonder that a community governed upon a system of such daring iniquity should have been torn by internal dissensions, and regarded with suspicion and hostility by all around. Many

of those whom the prophet associated with himself in the government of Nauvoo, separated from him ; among them some of his early accomplices, and even Sidney Rigdon himself, the partner of his fraud from the beginning,—the feelings of the father overcoming every other consideration, on his making the discovery that Smith had attempted to add his daughter to the number of his “spiritual wives.” The depredations of the Mormonites, and their lawless conduct, soon rendered them as obnoxious in Illinois as they had been in Missouri, and after another Mormon war, in the course of which Joseph himself, with his brother Hyrum, lost his life, being shot by an armed mob, in Carthage gaol, the remnant of the Nauvooans migrated still further west, and effected a settlement in California, where they cut a conspicuous figure, in that entertaining and instructive work, recently published; *Life in the Far West*, by G. F. Ruxton.

But what is truly surprising, is that, notwithstanding all the reverses which the leaders of the sect suffered, their dissensions among one another, and the exposure of the fraud and imposture of the prophet himself, thousands should still be found who regard Joseph in the light of a martyr ; who receive the “Book of Mormon” and the “Doctrine and Covenants” as inspired writings ; and who look for the fulfilment of the promises given to the “Latter Day Saints” by the vilest religious impostor which the world has seen since the days of Mahomet. At this present moment we have reason to believe that the number of Mormonites in England is not much under 30,000. In London and the suburbs alone they have near upon twenty different meeting-houses, though all of very moderate dimensions. With fanatical expectations of worldly prosperity and temporal glory, the professors of Mormonism combine the most bitter hostility against every existing religious system, and especially against the true Catholic and Apostolic Church, whose communion they deny, and whose ordinances they revile in the grossest and most offensive terms. Their creed is a tissue of ignorance and profaneness, founded upon the most palpable perversions of Holy Scripture, and characterized by the most carnal conceptions of things spiritual. We had intended to have given an outline of the doctrines of the sect as they are set forth at the present time by the preachers of Mormonism in Europe and in America ; but we have already so far exceeded our limits, that we must adjourn this part of our proposed labours to a future opportunity, if, indeed we shall ever be able to afford leisure and space to revert to a subject which would be altogether unworthy of serious attention, but for the extensive spread among our benighted populations of so fearful a spiritual pestilence.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. Wanderings of a Pilgrim in search of the Picturesque. 2. Cook's Acts of the Apostles, with Commentary. 3. Hoare's Letters to Sir Geo. Grey, Bart. 4. Sortain's Sermons. 5. Chronological Catena of Ancient Fathers and Councils, &c. 6. Gresley's Help to Prayer. 7. Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England. 8. Sermon preached at Magdalen Hospital, April 28, 1850. 9. Remarks on the Judgment in the case of Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter. 10. The Cross and the Serpent. 11. A Course of Sermons preached at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. 12. The Singers of the Sanctuary and the Missionary. 13. A New Elucidation of the Principles of Speech and Elocution. By A. M. Bell. 14. The Churchman's Companion, at Home and in Distant Lands. 15. Memoir of the Rev. Thos. Dikes. 16. Scriptural Communion with God. 17. Footprints of the Creator. 18. Sermons preached in the Chapel of Harrow School. 19. Evans's Scripture Biography. 20. Pilgrimages to St. Mary of Walsingham and St. Thomas of Canterbury. 21. The Diaconate and the Poor. 22. Tales. 23. Letters. 24. Sermons. By Rev. H. Hughes. 25. Manual of the British Marine Algæ. 26. The Jamaica Movement. 27. Walcott's Memorials of Westminster. 28. The Resurrection of the Flesh. By H. B. Bowlby. 29. Meditations on the Suffering Life of our Saviour while on Earth. 30. The Pilgrim's Hand-book. 31. The Mercy-Seat. 32. Sermons for the Sundays and Principal Holy-days throughout the Year. 33. The Church Schoolmaster. 34. Historico-Critical Introduction to the Pentateuch. 35. Occasional Sermons. By C. Wordsworth. 36. Sermons with reference to the Gorham Case. 37. Wilberforce's Sermons. 38. Eruvin. 39. Vaughan's Sermons. 40. The Age. 41. In Memoriam. 42. A result of Meditation on the Bible. 43. Letters in Vindication of the Church of Ireland. 44. Deeds of Faith. 45. Holy Men of Old. 46. Sketches of Character. 47. Letters and Memoir of the late W. A. Shirley, D.D. 48. Liber Precum Publicarum. 49. Sermons. 50. The Parson's Home. 51. The Judgments on Baptismal Regeneration. 52. Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. 53. Voyage to Baffin's Bay and Lancaster Sound. 54. An Elementary Course of Geology, Mineralogy, and Physical Geography. 55. A Treatise on the Climate and Meteorology of Madeira. 56. Plain Parish Sermons. 57. Letters to my Children on Moral Subjects. 58. Common Sense versus Common Law. 59. A Plea for the Faithful Restoration of our Ancient Churches, &c. 60. Three Advent Sermons. 61. The Influence of the Hebrew and Christian Revelations on Heathen Writers. 62. Prayers and Rules for the Ordering of a Church Guild. 63. Guardian Angels. 64. Phases of Faith. 65. God in Christ. 66. Evening Thoughts. 67. A Critical History of the Language and Situation of Ancient Greece. 68. Apocalyptic Sketches. 69. Sermons. 70. An Apology for the Septuagint. 71. Alison's Essays. 72. Translation of Herman Venema's inedited Institutes of Theology. 73. Williams's Gospel Harmony. 74. Jesus the Giver and the Fulfiller of the New Law. Miscellaneous.

1.—*Wanderings of a Pilgrim in search of the Picturesque, during Four-and-Twenty Years in the East, with Revelations of Life in the Zenana.* By فانی یارکس. Illustrated with Sketches from Nature. 2 vols. London: Richardson.

THE tone of bold and careless frankness in which this interesting and instructive work is written, is singularly attractive. "Les Indoos peints par eux mêmes" might be its title; for the "Pilgrim" appears to possess such thorough sympathy with, and knowledge of, the people described, as almost to be identified with them; and to enter so completely as the author has done

into the character of a people so difficult, and, in most cases, so impossible to appreciate and understand, evinces no ordinary power of observation, memory, and combination. The personal adventures, which are very interesting, are agreeably told, and possess all the freshness arising from their having been written down at the moment, instead of being reserved for the stiffness of a narrative intended for publication. The descriptions of customs and manners appear to evince a thorough knowledge of the subject: indeed we are not acquainted with any work which conveys so much minute information in matters of the every-day life of India, both amongst the native and the European population; and, judging from the survey which we have been enabled to take of this publication, we think it can scarcely fail to be popular with all who take an interest in India, and indeed with all who happen to meet with it; for the amount of anecdote, and gossip, and detail, extending to the most minute points, and especially such points as ladies are peculiarly interested in, is such as quite to take this work out of the ordinary class of books of travels; and we can assure our readers, that this very ponderous work, in two stupendous octavos, contains as much amusing and light reading as if it were split into half a hundred pretty little manuals, better adapted to the hands of young ladies than the magnificent tomes before us. In this publication we revel in all the luxury of beautiful type and paper, and a gorgeousness of illustration, which appears to have been the result of Oriental ideas rather than of our more sober father-land. Plate after plate of engravings, glowing in the bright colours of India, and in many cases with gold, place before the eye that strange state of society where men live on rice and dress in cloth of gold; and where a bride would be overwhelmed with despair if her fortune were placed at her banker's instead of being expended in her wedding feast.

In truth it is a strange and curious state of society, which we can scarcely form a notion of without the aid of a work like this. In glancing through its amusing pages, our eye is caught in one place with an estimate of the expense of maintaining an establishment of *fifty-seven* servants,—such, apparently, being the allowance for a family of moderate pretensions! This retinue is maintained, it seems, for the small outlay of 290*l.* per annum! The wonder is, how these unfortunates contrive to exist; but apparently their *duties* are far from arduous: in one instance, the authoress describes the whole employment of one servant in a house as consisting in the duty of rubbing the master's eyebrows when his head ached; and this servant was highly affronted at being asked to rub any other part of the frame!

There is a long account of a wedding between a young lady,

who was half Hindoo and half European, with a Prince of the Royal House of Delhi. The young couple were *without fortune* ; but, nevertheless, the wedding was conducted on such a scale of grandeur, that all our European weddings sink into very tame affairs indeed in comparison. Endless ceremonies ; processions of people carrying hundreds of trays filled with all sorts of presents ; the bride and bridegroom anointed with a singular and very disagreeable unguent, and kept without motion (or sleep, we believe,) for several days ; the slaves and all the company pelting each other with fruit, vegetables, &c. ; the bride and bridegroom's neat little attentions to each other in the shape of lumps of sugar eaten off the person in some cases, and even, in one instance, off the shoe ; powdering the face with gold and silver dust ; and hanging all kinds of fruits about the body ; all accompanied by music, dancing, feasting, scrambling, and mock fighting ; in the midst of which the bridegroom gallantly carries off the bride in his arms, amidst the simulated grief of all the company ; and wound up by the departure, in which the newly-married pair are attended by an enormous procession of plates, dishes, furniture, and wearing apparel ;—is altogether about the most amusing piece of extravagance we have ever perused.

We cannot say that we like every thing in the volume. In fact, the description of a state of society, in which the gross and voluptuous systems of Hindoo and Mahomedan superstition are so universally prevalent, and in which Christianity is so often disgraced by the conduct of its nominal professors, must, if faithfully described, present features revolting to every right-minded person. It is a difficult and a painful subject for a female writer ; and our authoress accordingly passes over much that she must have witnessed, and touches but briefly on the darker parts of the picture. The work, however, even as it is, discloses but too plainly the fearful moral atmosphere of India, and the evil effects which the continual presence of vice is calculated to produce, on those who are not guarded against it by the highest religious principles.

II.—*The Acts of the Apostles: with a Commentary, and Practical and Devotional Suggestions, for Readers and Students of the English Bible. By the Rev. F. C. Cook, M.A., one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.* London: Longmans.

THE author of this volume has executed a work for which the student of the English Bible has reason to feel gratitude. He will now be able to peruse the Acts of the Apostles with the aid of a Commentary exacting from him no knowledge of the original language, and no skill in Biblical criticism, but bringing to his aid

a judicious selection and abridgment of those comments which critics of all ages have accumulated for the illustration of the Acts. In the present day, the history of the Apostles and of the earliest Church become continually more important to us, as we are thrown back more and more upon the first principles of Christian communion, by the gradual severing of those bonds which for many ages connected the Church and the State. In this study, Mr. Cook's really valuable work will be a safe companion and guide. We observe that he refers freely to German commentators; but we can attest, with thankfulness, his own exemption from tendencies in the direction of those systems of speculation which have gained for Germany an unhappy celebrity. His pages are characterized by the simplicity and sobriety of faith, while enriched by the stores of criticism; and we have been much edified by the tone of practical piety which pervades the devotional reflections at the end of each chapter.

The text of the Acts is printed with the Commentary, so that the student has before him the whole apparatus for the study of this important book.

Unlike the majority of our modern comments on Scripture, Mr. Cook's volume is adapted for the use of intelligent persons in general, even if they should be unacquainted with the learned languages. To those engaged in the instruction of classes in Sunday Schools, and to the teachers of National Schools, it will be eminently useful; and we feel assured that they will, in following Mr. Cook's Commentary, teach sound principles, both in doctrine and discipline, to the children entrusted to their care.

We shall select a passage from the Comment, with a view to show Mr. Cook's mode of treating his subject.

"Acts ii. 1.—And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all, with one accord, in one place.

"1.—'*The day of Pentecost.*' Pentecost means fiftieth, and is used as a substantive. In the Old Testament it is called 'the Feast of Weeks,' and was kept at the end of seven weeks, or fifty days—including the day of the festival—after the Passover. As the Hebrew festival was instituted as a season of rejoicing and thanksgiving for the harvest, it was also called 'the Feast of In-gathering and First-fruits,' or, 'of Harvest.' Two loaves, made of new meal, were then offered in the temple as first-fruits.—Levit. xxiii. 17—20; Numb. xxviii. 27—29. So the Christian festival, which we term 'Whitsuntide,' commemorates the in-gathering of the first converts, whom God 'begat, of his own will, with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures.'—James i. 18. The Hebrews also celebrated the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, on the last day of the seven weeks; and, latterly, they called the festival, 'the rejoicing of the Law.' We have

to commemorate the complete and effectual revelation of that Law, which was henceforth written by the Holy Ghost, 'not on tables of stone, but on the fleshly tablets' of regenerate hearts.

"*'Was fully come.'* According to the Law (Levit. xxiii. 15) the fifty days were reckoned from the end of the first day of Easter, or the sixteenth of Nisan, on which the paschal lamb was slain. In the year of our Lord's passion the sixteenth of Nisan began on Thursday evening at six o'clock, and lasted until the same hour on Friday. This day of Pentecost, therefore, began at six o'clock on the Saturday of the seventh week, and was fully come on the Sunday morning; so that 'this day which the Lord hath made' is consecrated by the two most important events in the history of the world—the resurrection of Christ, and the coming of the Holy Ghost.

"*'All.'* All the Christians; viz. the 120 mentioned in the first chapter.

"*'In one place.'* The place where the disciples were assembled must have been the temple. In the first place; it was 'the third hour of the day,' (ver. 15,) i. e. nine o'clock in the morning, the hour of the morning sacrifice, when none of them were likely to be absent from the temple, even on a common day, (see ver. 46,) and certainly not on the great day of the festival. This reason appears to me to be conclusive. In the next place: it is not probable that the 'multitude of devout persons' mentioned, (ver. 9,) would have assembled in any other part of Jerusalem. The early Fathers are unanimous in this opinion. 'The house in which they were sitting' (ver. 2) was, probably, one of the large rooms, of which, as we learn from Josephus, there were thirty adjoining the great court of the temple; and which appear to have been open to any worshippers who might wish to assemble for devotional purposes. Thus the solemn inauguration of the Church of Christ took place in the sanctuary of the ancient covenant."

The "Practical and Devotional Suggestion" on this is as follows:—

"1—4. When Christians meet with one accord in places consecrated to the Lord's service, He will surely fulfil his promise to 'be in the midst of them,' and will vouchsafe proofs of his presence, which, though they may be imperceptible to the senses, will be recognized by the eye of faith, and produce results equally unmistakeable with the miraculous gifts which attested the descent of his Holy Spirit at Pentecost."

III.—*Three Letters to Sir George Grey, Bart., &c., on the Baptismal and Educational Questions. By the Rev. WILLIAM H. HOARE, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Rivingtons.*

If political questions were determined in the present day by considerations founded on justice, religion, and common sense, the Letters before us ought to exercise a material influence on the

important subjects to which they refer; and while we must lament to feel that the rulers of the State in these times are, in their official capacity, likely to give little heed to reasoning, however forcible, if it is based on the religious peculiarities (as they would call them) of the Church of England, we must yet feel, that every writer who, like Mr. Hoare, states truth, and states it clearly, forcibly, and in such a tone as to render it attractive to the intellectual and cultivated classes of society, is a real benefactor to truth. In the Letters before us, Mr. Hoare enters on an examination of the leading principles on which the Bill introduced this session by Mr. Fox depends. He proves very satisfactorily that, to meet the present exigencies of the country, an education is required which shall be not merely of a secular character, but chiefly of a religious character. And we doubt not, that the earnest, and in some places eloquent, expostulations of the writer, may have touched a responsive chord in the hearts of some of those who aided in throwing out Mr. Fox's Bill. Many men adhere to religion for some time, when they have cast from them the truths on which it reposes. The State of England has, for many years, ceased to possess a creed, and it includes Unitarians and unbelievers of all kinds, and, without doubt, will, ere long, include Jews and Mohammedans; yet, religion will still be recognised in some degree. And, accordingly, we may remark, that Lord John Russell objected to Mr. Fox's Bill, because it did not include any provision for religious education. The necessity of a religious education, nay, of a Christian education, is, indeed, conceded by the great majority of intelligent men at present; nor will there be any objection to admit the corollary which Mr. Hoare annexes to it—that it is the duty of the Government to assist in providing such an education for the people. The large grants made to the Committee of Council for Education, and the mode of their employment, indicate sufficiently the recognition of the general principle; but we fear that all community of principle parts at this point. Mr. Hoare argues in his "Second Letter" with great propriety, that the State is bound either to support the teaching of the Church of England exclusively in the schools, or else to aid her schools in common with those of other religious communions, leaving to her, as well as to others, freedom to inculcate her own principles. The chief part of his argument is concerned with a refutation of the notion, that morality can be taught without religion, and that religion can be taught without the admission of particular forms. This last notion is only one branch of that insidious system which meets us at every turn,—that religion is independent of all dogmas,—that, in other words, it is not inseparable from a belief in revelation. Such is

the shape in which infidelity appears in the present age; and the great divisions so long existing in England, having, in the event, led to a compromise and a combination of all sects in the State, the way is opened for such propositions as Mr. Fox's. Mr. Hoare argues with great force and eloquence against such false principles, and urges the duty of the State to uphold the truth of the Gospel. He is one of those who are able still to see in the State and the Church merely different aspects of the same community, according to the view stated by Hooker, and so perfectly applicable in his days. To us, we confess, it seems, that the alteration in the religion of the State, by its rejecting the creed of the Church of England in 1828 and 1829, is so great, that we do not see how it is possible any longer to regard it as a State which we can look upon as holding a common faith with ourselves. We think that when men begin to consider the actual state of things, as distinguished from theories, and from the *former* state of things, they will be obliged to come, however reluctantly, to the same conclusion as that to which we have ourselves arrived. With the exception of this point of difference, there is scarcely any thing in which we cannot agree with Mr. Hoare; and we tender to him our thanks for the gratification which we have derived from the perusal of his able and excellent Letters.

IV.—*Sermons.* By JOSEPH SORTAIN, A.B., of Trinity College, Dublin; Minister of North Street Chapel, Brighton. London: Longmans.

THE author of the volume of discourses before us is a dissenting minister; but his Sermons give evidence of no ordinary mental power and cultivation. If narrow views and prejudices have been sometimes supposed to characterize dissent, they are certainly not to be found in Mr. Sortain's pages: nor will we say that he is one of those advocates of a vague and unlimited speculation in religion, whose perilous theories have been substituted for the dogmatism which used to distinguish sectarianism. On the contrary, while Mr. Sortain advocates the rights of conscience in a tone which is as firm as it is charitable, he maintains most of the leading doctrines of Christianity with decision and boldness: the doctrine of baptismal regeneration alone being rejected.

As mere literary productions these Sermons possess high merit. Their language and style are forcible and eloquent; adapted rather to a highly-cultivated audience, than to what we should imagine to be the style of congregations that collect in a dissenting meeting-house. Indeed, were we to point out a fault in these discourses, we should say that they are rather too ambitious—

that there is a want of Christian simplicity. This is, however, a defect which they share with the discourses of Chalmers and Robert Hall; and we think the writer of the Sermons before us may very fairly be considered to hold an intellectual position on a level with either of the distinguished individuals whom we have named.

We extract the following passage, as affording a specimen of Mr. Sortain's style:—

“ Our last practical consideration of the immutableness of Jesus Christ is, its influence upon

“ 2.—*Our constancy and consistency in Christian doctrine.* We rest our authority for this reference on the immediate transition of the Apostle to the command, ‘ Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines.’ . . . As if he had said—In the infinite scheme of the Gospel there is one central, and at the same time universal, element; one with which all the innumerable constituents of that scheme—reach though it does from eternity to eternity—are homogenous; one which is its Sun of Righteousness—the Sun, not of a single system, but of all the systems of the spiritual universe, with which as they move, though in the remotest fields of lights, they ever harmonize. Beware, therefore, of aught that is alien from its inviolable simplicity. ‘ Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines.’

“ How much this must regulate into consistency our religious opinions, will appear from the untiring eagerness with which philosophy, in all time, has sought after primal truths. Even in its infancy it so intensely felt the want of these, that, in the impatience of its poverty, it grasped at fictions. And now that, taught in sorrow the follies of its fancy, it can content itself with nothing but the real, see it, as it ascends, step by step; never satisfied with its classifications, however severally consistent, until it attains the law which combines and unifies them all. ‘ Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever’—is *that* to the Gospel—nay, to all moral truth—which *that* would be to the science of the heavens if we could find some luminary, the focus of all worlds, whence all light, and heat, and attraction have been made by the Creator to irradiate. Yet, no! this, like all analogies, falls infinitely below Him and his relation. For He, Creator and Redeemer, is, *as Jesus Christ*, that Being ‘ whose centre is every where, whose circumference is no where.’—pp. 114—116.

We lament that so much ability and piety as these Sermons evince should not be employed in a more appropriate sphere than that to which they are at present restricted.

v.—*A Chronological Catena of Ancient Fathers and Councils, together with the Teaching of the Reformers, and more recent Divines of our Church, on the Doctrine of Spiritual Regeneration*

in Holy Baptism. Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1850.

IN the present state of that great and vital question, which forms the subject of this work, the latter will naturally be regarded with deep interest. At all times that doctrine, which is to the Christian life what that of the Trinity is to the Catholic faith—the root, foundation, germ, and source of the whole—must be viewed with love and reverence and grateful loyalty: every thing which tends to support or illustrate it must be received with thankfulness; every thing which in any way assails or impugns it should be treated as an outrage on the Written Word, as well as a rebellion against the Church. At present, under the painful circumstances in which a lay tribunal has decided on the meaning of a priest's ordination vows, a peculiar value attaches to the volume under review. Such Catenæ are of importance, not because, as our opponents ignorantly assert, and also many of our own friends ignorantly admit, they state the views of this or that particular man—but because they prove that the Written Word of GOD was understood in the beginning as we expound it now, in its plain, literal, and grammatical sense, and show that the doctrine in question was always considered as an integral portion of the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

This “Catena” has also other merits, of a secondary but still high order, in the holy and edifying nature of many of the extracts.

What can be more beautiful than the following passage from Gregory Nazianzen?—

“Seest thou one naked? Clothe him, reverencing *thine own garment of immortality*, and that is Christ. ‘For as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.’”—p. 31.

What can be more magnificent than the following from Sulpicius Severus, Bishop of Bituricum in Gaul, who flourished A.D. 418?—

“Why, foolish woman, dost thou soothe and flatter thyself? In the beginning GOD made two of mankind, from whom the whole host of the human race sprung forth. Natural equality gives not earthly nobility, but the ambition of covetousness; and there can be no difference betwixt those *whom the second birth* hath brought forth, *by which* both rich and poor, free and slave, noble and ignoble, *is made the son of GOD*, and earthly nobility is eclipsed by the splendour of *heavenly glory*.”—p. 37.

Alas! if we dwelt rather more on the doctrine of baptismal fraternity—that blazing beacon of the early Church—we should have

far less difficulty in maintaining that of baptismal regeneration. It is because we have basely forgotten the one, that we find ourselves now compelled to do battle for the other.

VI.—*A Help to Prayer : in Six Tracts. By the Rev. W. GRESLEY, M. A., Prebendary of Lichfield.* Oxford and London: Parker. 1850.

A VALUABLE and excellent little work ; full of that strict common sense, for which the author is so well known, and at the same time truly spiritual. We heartily recommend it.

VII.—*The Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England. (Published under the sanction of the Central Committee of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.) Diocese of Oxford.* Oxford and London : John Henry Parker. 1850.

A VALUABLE work as a book of reference, and interesting to the student of architectural antiquities ; carefully done, and well got up.

VIII.—“*Bear ye one another's Burdens.*” *A Sermon, preached in the Chapel of the Magdalen Hospital, London, April 28, 1850. By ALFRED POTT, M.A.* Oxford and London: John H. Parker. 1850.

WE have never met with any discourse which more truly, fully, and holily proclaims the duty of Christian love—a duty which men have well-nigh forgotten in their contests after those things which, however high and holy they be, are only its instruments ; for, “the end of the commandment is love.” We wish that all, but especially men who glory in their orthodoxy, would read this truly beautiful Sermon. It can scarcely fail of benefiting any one who has a mind to understand, or a heart to feel, or a conscience to upbraid them.

IX.—*Remarks on the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council in the Case of “Gorham v. The Lord Bishop of Exeter.”* By a SOLICITOR. J. H. Parker. 1850.

THIS is a very valuable pamphlet, and such as will amply repay the reading ; which is more than can be said of the generality of such publications. In fact, no sooner does a question arise in Church or State, than every man with more leisure than zeal, who has the misfortune to possess a good pen and ink that runs easily, sets to work and defiles his portion of letter-paper—for we fear that the more appropriate foolscap is getting out of fashion.

We are happy to see that an excellently drawn up petition is now lying for signature at Mr. Parker's, and that it has been numerously signed, praying "That your Majesty will be pleased to give your royal assent, that all questions touching the doctrine of the Church of England, arising in appeal from your Majesty's Temporal Courts, shall hereafter, (as suggested to your Majesty's predecessor, King Edward VI.,) be referred to a Synod.—That your Majesty will be pleased to give your royal sanction to a Bill for enacting that the Judgment of such Synod shall be binding upon the Temporal Courts of these Realms."

We deem it expedient that all those who have signed, or shall hereafter sign, this petition, should be invited to enter into an engagement not to vote for a representative in Parliament of the University of Oxford, unless he will pledge himself to bring in such a Bill, and to do his uttermost to get it made the law of the land.

Why minds should be perplexed by the Gorham case, we know not: to us it seems but a warning voice, crying "Up and be doing." We do not read that either Ezra or Nehemiah were *perplexed* by the malice and power of the Ammonites, Moabites, and Samaritans, and their friends in high places: they prayed to the GOD of their fathers, and then acquitted themselves like men. Ours is a like trial, ours is a like duty; let us only manfully set about it, labouring with one hand and with our weapons in the other, and we shall have a like success.

THE LORD OF HOSTS IS WITH US: THE GOD OF JACOB IS OUR REFUGE.

x.—*The Cross and the Serpent.* By the Rev. W. HASLAM.
Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1850.

THIS is a very curious and interesting work, and will amply repay a careful perusal. It has, indeed, its faults, both of manner and matter; and the author does not, to our mind, prove that the Cross was revealed to Adam in connexion with the triumph of the Seed of the woman over the serpent. He does, however, satisfactorily prove that much of the history of our Lord, and many of the doctrines of Christianity, were known by the immediate descendants of Noah, and must consequently have been revealed by GOD, either to that patriarch or our first parents. He entirely demolishes the very absurd and unscriptural notion, that man was left by his Creator to emerge from natural barbarism into civilization. He traces up many of the arts and sciences to the diluvian æra, and leads us to the conclusion, that GOD gave man, in the beginning, the use of letters and the rudiments of

science and art, as well as the power of language; so that barbarism, instead of being the natural state of man, is a retrocession from nature.

XI.—*The Character of Pilate and the Spirit of the Age. A Course of Sermons preached at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By WILLIAM SEWELL, B.D.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker, 1850.

THIS is one of those bold and single-minded expressions of deep conviction, which so strikingly characterize Mr. Sewell. When a future age shall have to inscribe its epitaph on this author, we doubt whether even the stores of his learning, the riches of his fancy, the treasures of his intellect, or the charm and energy of his eloquence, great and incontestable though all of them be, will leave such an impression behind them, as that simple-hearted love of truth, and that courage and eagerness in proclaiming that which he believes to be true, which so peculiarly distinguish him in an age which is so overrun with scepticism, sophistry, and special pleading. We must have Convocation the first moment that we can obtain it; but we heartily recommend these stirring and beautiful Sermons to all those who take an interest in the prospects or the spirit of the age.

XII.—*The Singers of the Sanctuary and The Missionary. Two Tales. By the Author of "Angels' Work."* London: John Henry Parker. 1850.

THOSE who have read that exquisite tale entitled "Angels' Work," will need no further reason for reading a work by the same author; and those who have not done so, cannot better employ the first spare cash and spare time that fall to their lot, than by purchasing and perusing that truly holy book. The Tales before us entirely justify the high estimation which his former volume had led us to entertain of the writer, and possess features which render them peculiarly adapted for the members of our Church. The holy married priest and his sweet helpful wife are exquisitely delineated, and yet portrayed with those little faults and foibles, without which no picture of humanity can be either true or harmless. To paint perfection, except in the Sinless One, is a lie, and, as such, is wrong as well as foolish. We earnestly wish this little volume a large circulation, and trust that the author will be spared to give us many more such treasures of wisdom and goodness.

XIII.—*A New Elucidation of the Principles of Speech and Elocution ; a full theoretical development, with numerous practical exercises, for the correction of imperfect, or the relief of impeded utterance, and for the general improvement of reading and speaking ; the whole forming a complete Directory for articulation, and expressive oral delivery.* By ALEXANDER MELVILLE BELL, *Professor of Elocution, &c.* Edinburgh : Kennedy, &c. 1849.

So runs the lengthy title-page of an octavo volume of 311 closely printed pages. And, turning from this to the very *puzzling*-looking interior, we were tempted to reverse the old proverb, and say—in reference to the author's *object*—"Here is much wool, and little cry." However, though we still think that there is more than needful of the "wool" (in the sense in which we have used the word), patience has shown us that there is also some "cry."

The author is "Professor of Elocution" in the capital of that portion of the Queen's dominions which is not famous for the elegance or correctness with which they pronounce Her Majesty's native tongue : and seeing that his father professes in London, and his brother in Dublin, it may be hoped that these counter-acting forces (to speak statically) result in a pleasant equilibrium, and render the Professor's labours of some service "for the general improvement of reading and speaking." We are informed in the "Preface," that "in his professional practice, the author daily felt the want of *collected material* to exemplify principles, and to furnish pupils with the means of private exercise upon them. . . . It became, therefore, necessary that a text-book of principles and exercises should be in his hand." And, truly, he has collected material enough. Not that we undervalue the importance of the subject, or entertain an opinion one whit more favourable than the Professor's as to the reading and speaking of ninety-nine hundredths of Her Majesty's subjects. We wish the Messieurs Bell all success in their undertaking ; and, could we have our own will, every school and college in the three kingdoms should ring with the teachings of some elocutionary *bell*. But we venture to think that—however intelligible and excellent our author's oral instructions may be—it will require a person to be uncommonly in earnest before he will be at the pains to wade through, so as really to profit by them, the hopeless-looking strings of homœo-phonetic words (if we may compound one for the occasion) which occupy the Second Part of the volume, or the still more puzzling numbers and hieroglyphics by which, respectively, he would denote the vowel articulations and the inflexions of the voice.

A work of this kind, to be really of use, should, we apprehend, be such as would teach a foreigner (always supposing he had patience to study it) the correct pronunciation of our language. We doubt whether that before us could accomplish this. No question, but it is a most difficult matter to represent sounds, especially diphthongal sounds, to the eye; but we are not now speaking of its practicability, or of the right way of effecting it. Mr. Bell has attempted it, and all we say is—that we question the entire success of his plan. For instance, he gives “a Table of the English Vowels numbered from 1 to 13,” in which we observe,

1 ee (l)		(p) ä (ll) (p) oo (ll)	13
	7	ear (n)	8
	ah		

And he continues:—

“There are, besides, three combinations of simple sounds contained in the above table, forming the

DIPHTHONGS.

7-1, as in *i* (isle) | 7-13, as in *ow* (l)
10-1, as in *oi* (l).”

Now we must demur to the pronunciation of the accented vowel in the word *isle*, or any word into which *i* similarly enters, being properly represented by his “7-1,” that is, by the combination of *a* pronounced as in the interjection *ah*, with that of *e* as in *eel*. Nor does he appear to us more happy in the mode adopted of expressing *ow* in owl, by combining the open *a* with the *u* of *pull*. That our readers may understand better the mode which Mr. Bell employs, we will present them with one stanza taken at random from several pages of benumbered words:—

10 7-1 5 5 1 8 2 11
“God might have bade the earth bring forth
1 9 10 3 5 10
Enough for great and small;
1 12 1 5 2 1 7 1
The oak tree and the cedar tree,
2 7-13 6 7-13-8 5 10
Without a flower at all.”

Upon which specimen it may be further observed, that the vowels in *have* and *bade* are designated by the same number; which number, on referring to his table gives ä (n). Now this we deem calculated to mislead. These two words in juxta-position supply an instance of one of the multitudinous anomalies of our language: we have *a* before a consonant with *e* *mute* suffixed,

taking—according to the pronunciation of them universally received in polite society—a different sound in the two words. In this, then, we say, Mr. Bell's numbering is faulty. Of course, if he chooses to publish "a New and Consistent Mode of Pronouncing the English Tongue," he is welcome to do so; and he may get men to follow it if he can. But so long as he aspires to no higher office than teaching us to speak our own language *as it is*, it must mislead to be told that both "have" and "bade" are to be pronounced in the same way. Does he mean to pronounce "have" like "bade," or "bade" like "have?" If the former, then his ear has become vitiated by the northern accent; if the latter (and it just occurs to us that he intended this), then we tell him that he is guilty of a vulgarism. So again we must object to his marking of *flower*. We are informed in a previous note, that "a *hyphen* between two numbers indicates that the sounds are diphthongally blended." Hence, if the sound of the diphthong *ow* is represented by 7-13, and that of *e* by 8,—then, since this "diphthongally blended" with the former combination, we argue that the student can derive no other impression than that the entire word is to be pronounced as a single syllable. But *e* cannot form a diphthong with *ow* (except with a totally different effect). Therefore this word can only be pronounced as a monosyllable, by the *elision* of the *e*. That the writer of these verses meant to use the word monosyllabically, we do not dispute; but then a professor who sets up to "correct imperfect utterance," ought to express this by the presence of the eliding comma; or, at all events, by some other process than that of giving a distinct pronunciation to the *e*, and yet appearing to "blend it diphthongally" with the previous syllable. *Flower* is a dissyllable—*flow'r* is a monosyllable. Let them not be confounded in the student's mind.

But we are likely to be at issue with the Professor on this point; for we perceive that, at p. 55, he lays it down that "*R* is not an articulation except when before a vowel." We differ from him herein (unless, indeed, we misunderstand his meaning). We hold that it is quite possible to pronounce the *r* in such words as *gorge*, *discern*, *warm*, *convert*, *flow'r*; and that the pronouncing or non-pronouncing it is just one of the *differentia* of good and bad reading.

The Professor is evidently *au fait* with his subject; and with much that he says we cordially agree. The following passage commands our ready assent:—

"To be able to read well at sight is not the work of a day; nor is it a power ever to be gained by the indolent or unthinking, or by those

who neglect the study of reading as a science and an art. There is a vocal logic, a rhetoric of inflexion, a poetry of modulation, a commentator's explanatoriness of tone—and these are combined in effective reading. The musician's consummate skill, the delicacy of execution, in keeping the simple *air* running with a wavy current in the midst of a river of variations, has its counterpart in the reader's vocal adaptation of sound to sense. The painter's artistic excellence in selecting objects to be struck out with varied effects, or covered down for contrast, is emulated by the skilful reader, in the due subordination and prominence of every thought and circumstance, according to its relative importance. A master of ceremonies is not more punctilious in his arrangements, than the voice of a tasteful and judicious reader. . . . No man who felt his failings, and knew what might be done by the reader, would ever open his mouth in public to deteriorate the taste of an audience by such gross incompetency as is but too often manifested by public readers.

“To become a good reader requires long practice and deep study. It requires more than rules can teach, or art principle¹; yet it demands nothing which the mind may not discover for itself, when it has become accustomed to fix its attention, and concentrate its powers in reading. The voice will soon learn expressive obedience, when it habitually watches for, and can recognize the mental promptings.”—p. 242.

All this is sensible and true; and the want of this study and training of the voice, and of that which directs the voice—the understanding, is lamentably felt. Reading, like theology, would appear in the opinion of mankind to come to us naturally. And the consequence is, that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, when a person of education is called on in society to read something aloud, or a clergyman gets into the reading-desk, we are pained with an exhibition such as ought not to be suffered in the upper class of a national school. Really, without the slightest exaggeration or metaphor, we do not ourselves know above three or four *good* readers in the whole circle of our acquaintance. We cannot call merely *fluent* reading *good* reading, among educated men. The ear must be able to discriminate, and the obedient voice distinctly to utter the various minute gradations of vowel sound which belong to our own, perhaps, more than to almost any European language. Expression, emphasis, inflexion and modulation of voice, these all have their place among the *conditions* of good reading and speaking.

Now to speak of one of these—Emphasis; Why do we so constantly hear it wrongly or ineffectively laid? Chiefly from two causes, which may be thus stated,—*Ignorance of the principle by*

¹ We would beg to ask where Mr. Bell found this *verb*? He seems to be fond of ringing newly-coined changes upon the root, for he elsewhere uses the word *principle*.

which it is to be made, and Ignorance of the principle on which it should be made. Under the latter, we include what the Professor calls “error in the management of adjectives and qualifying phrases,” and we would add more particularly, of pronouns and pronominal adjectives;—the “*I pray and beseech you, to accompany me with a pure heart,*” &c., of the General Confession. Under the former, we will exemplify our meaning in our author’s words. He says:—

“Emphasis is commonly considered to be merely an increased *stress* of voice or articulation; but there is an emphasis of *time*, produced by a slower or quicker rate of utterance; an emphasis of *modulation*, by a change, as it were, of the key-note to a higher or lower pitch; an emphasis of *inflection*, by a sweep of the voice upwards or downwards; an emphasis of *monotone*, by a solemn, little-varying movement of the voice; an emphasis of *aspiration*, by a sighing, husky, or choking expression of the voice; an emphasis of *whisper* even; and, combined with nearly all these modes of giving prominence to words, the emphasis of *pause*,—besides the emphasis of *force* or *stress*, which is vulgarly considered the type of all emphasis.”—p. 255.

The *pause* we hold to be, perhaps, the most generally effective instrument of emphasis, and the least understood.

Much, too, depends upon *rhythm*, and what the Professor calls *grouping*; but we have not space to enter into this. We may say in one word, “the power of oratory has its foundations in the principles of our nature.”

But we would ask, by way of conclusion to these remarks, how we can expect persons who do not pretend to be wiser than their neighbours in such matters, to pronounce correctly, when we find blunders like the following in the mouths of professors of elocution. Our author, at p. 214, “takes occasion to point out what he conceives to be the defects” of some of Mr. Pitman’s *Manual of Phonography*; the same writer whom he had quoted (not, however, with approbation) at p. 29, for the following extraordinary assertion—viz., that *u* in *nut* is the short sound of *o* in *note*; sounds, which “Mr. P. declares to be *identical in quality, and different only in quantity or duration!*” We may add, that we have ourselves, within the last day or two, met with a parallel. We were looking over some sheets of Progressive Reading Lessons for Infant Schools (we forget the precise title), with the name of Mr. Varty attached to them—of the famous educational firm of Roake and Varty in the Strand; and in one of them we observed, and called to it the attention of a friend and the shopman (for we feared to state such a thing unsupported by witnesses), we observed one of the lessons on vowels headed thus:—

“*a* as in *c u r* ;”

and the examples given were *liar, vicar, tankard*, and a dozen or two more equally apposite ! Professor Bell, with all his faults, has not, we rejoice to say, been guilty of any blunder so untrue and so vulgar as this.

XIV.—*The Churchman's Companion, at Home, and in Distant Lands.*
By the Rev. THOMAS DOWELL, B.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Wellington Heath, Herefordshire. London: Longmans.

THIS is a work which, on the whole, we can highly recommend. How much of its matter is original we cannot undertake to say, but it professes to be mainly a compilation from Ambrose Serle, Bishop Mant, Hooker, Wogan, Hole, &c. It consists of a Series of Sermons, thirty-four in number, extending from the First Sunday in Advent to Trinity Sunday, the purport of each of which is, to draw, as it were, the services of each day to a special focus, combining in one view, the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, and First Lessons for Morning and Evening Service. Much of the work is admirably done, and that, after a fashion likely to prove very acceptable to the emigrants, for whom it was in the first instance designed. Nothing that could be construed by malevolence into a sign of partizanship will be found in these pages, yet, strict Church principles seem to be maintained. Thus, the duty and efficacy of fasting is placed in a very clear point of view, especially in the Sermon for Ash-Wednesday ; and, again, Baptismal Regeneration is strongly insisted on in the Sermon for the First Sunday after Easter. We make two short extracts in confirmation of these facts : the first from page 202.

“The first and most obvious meaning of fasting, is to deny ourselves the full enjoyment of our daily food. Not that we are to suppose of God, that He has bestowed on us so many things convenient for us, without design that we should partake of them with thankfulness and joy. Certainly not :—but there is a time for all things,—as for enjoyment, so also for restraint. The practice of self-denial, moreover, tends to give a man more command over his appetites, more power over himself, more authority over those perverse and corrupt lusts in which many of his temptations begin.”

Our second quotation is of a yet more decisive character.

“Let us, then, believe with holy confidence, that the Spirit of God doth indeed move upon the waters of Baptism, rendering them efficacious to the purging away the guilt of original sin, to the renewing our natures, and planting within us the seeds of spiritual life.”—p. 281.

Those clergymen will not make a bad selection who choose this

volume for a present to parishioners about to emigrate to "foreign parts:" and, indeed, it may be found useful in England also, conveying, as it does, much sound and instructive matter in a popular and unpretending form. We wish it success.

xv.—*Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Dikes, LL.B., Incumbent of St. John's Church, Hull, with copious extracts from his Correspondence. By the Rev. JOHN KING, M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Hull, &c.* London: Seeleys.

THE subject of this memoir was a very pious and excellent clergyman, of the Evangelical school, who died in 1847, after a ministerial career of about sixty years. We have been gratified and edified by the general tone of character here presented, though we feel that on some points we are unable to concur with the opinions advanced. Such of the sermons as we have perused, appear to combine a moderate view of those doctrines which are sometimes called "Calvinistic," with the enforcement of practical piety and morality. The discussion of such points as final perseverance and free-will before a congregation, is perhaps of rather questionable expediency as a general rule; but we are bound to say that what we have seen of Mr. Dikes' exposition of those and similar tenets, impress us with the conviction that he was more under the guidance of Scripture than of mere theory.

Mr. Dikes was the friend and associate of Bickersteth, Scott, Farish, and others of their school. He erected at his own expense a church at Hull, at a time when it was rare indeed to hear of such ventures in the cause of religion. He opposed himself with remarkable energy to the prevalent licentiousness and immorality, and he appears to have been charitable and tolerant in his feelings towards persons of a different class of opinions. He was strongly opposed to the concession of the Romish emancipation in 1829. We have the following remarks on this subject by the editor:—

"The storm which for some time had been gathering in reference to the Roman Catholic claims, now reached its height. It was soon known that the Government, with Wellington and Peel at its head, were inclined to surrender the great Protestant principles on which the constitution had been based at the commencement of the reign of William the Third. It was rumoured that his Majesty had (with reluctance) acquiesced in the wish of his ministers. At length Parliament assembled; the King's speech announced the projected change; and Sir Robert Peel stood up to deal, as best he might, with the arguments which he had himself so often advanced on the side which he had so suddenly deserted."—p. 131.

Mr. Dikes, on this occasion, did his duty manfully in attending a public meeting at Hull, and speaking strongly against the ministerial measure. We find him thus writing in 1845,—

“ I suppose you have felt deeply interested at Leeds, in the Maynooth question. It seems to me that some advantage may arise from manifesting a bold front of opposition to the measure ; for though it can avail nothing under present circumstances, yet it may prevent the adoption of further and more offensive measures. I have no doubt it was the intention of Sir Robert Peel and his friends to pay the Roman Catholic clergy ; but perhaps they will be afraid to hazard the attempt under present circumstances.”—p. 221.

The editor of this Life has appended certain remarks on Baptismal Regeneration, putting forth the same interpretation of our formularies which is contended for by Mr. Gorham.

XVI.—*Scriptural Communion with God ; or the Pentateuch and the Book of Job ; arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, &c. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, D.D., Canon of Durham, &c. In Two Vols. London : Rivingtons.*

THE author of these volumes has been long known and respected as amongst the most consistent and eloquent of our writers. His “ Historical and Chronological Arrangement of the Holy Bible ” has occupied a high place in public estimation, and in former years his publication, in controversy with Charles Butler, was of eminent service. That controversy has gone by, but it must at least be a melancholy satisfaction to have taken share in it. Such men as Dr. Townsend can tell the sincerity and the integrity of attachment to the Church of England which influenced the majority of her members in resisting the efforts of Romanism to gain political power. And they survive to feel that experience has proved they were *right* in believing the Church to be endangered by the grant of political power to its adversaries. It was easy to ridicule such apprehensions *then* ; but now they have changed into realities. Dr. Townsend represents the school of the last generation ; but we must do him the justice to say, that he is an assiduous student of the literature of the present day ; and of this, the work before us offers indisputable proof.

It consists of the five books of Moses, arranged in chronological order, and includes also the Book of Job, inserted at the proper point in the sacred history, according to the chronology of Dr. Hales, viz. before the call of Abraham. The whole is divided into short sections for family reading, each of which is preceded by an exposition, followed by a prayer, and accompanied by annotations of various kinds. Prefixed to the work, and in-

terspersed in it, are dedications to various exalted personages, one to the Pope, another to the Archbishop of Canterbury, urging for the most part the subject of Christian union. We confess that here we must look on our author as rather visionary and unpractical; for what use there can be in exhorting the Archbishop of Canterbury to seek for union with foreign churches, we know not; when we remember how much fettered the Church is at present, and how entirely the Archbishops are always under the influence of the temporal Government, and selected with a special view to the maintenance of that influence.

Dr. Townsend's expositions and prayers are, of course, intended chiefly for persons possessing some degree of education. The prayers are rather long, we think. The annotations are replete with valuable and important matter, and abound in defences of various principles and points against Infidels, Rationalists, Romanists, Romanizers, Dissenters, Unitarians, &c. &c. Altogether, Dr. Townsend's work is one of no ordinary character, and deserves a far more lengthened notice than it is now in our power to afford.

XVII.—*Footprints of the Creator; or "The Asterolepsis of Stromness."* By HUGH MILLER, Author of "*The Old Red Sandstone*," &c. London: Johnston & Hunter.

THE author of this work has acquired a high reputation by his previous researches into the structure of the earth. On the present occasion he appears before the world as the opponent of the "*Vestiges of Creation*," which, as our readers doubtless recollect, reduced creation to a nonentity, by advocating the Development theory. Mr. Miller, in the volume before us, addresses himself to the task of overthrowing this theory by the aid of *fact*. His researches in the more ancient geological formations have brought to light remains which exhibit a high degree of development as existing exactly at the period when the development theory would require the very reverse. Of course this is a very good argument. Mr. Miller plies it well; though the thread of his discourse is somewhat interrupted by the multitude of geological details into which he enters, and which are of inferior interest, except to a professed geologist.

XVIII.—*Nine Sermons, preached, for the most part, in the Chapel of Harrow School.* By CHARLES JOHN VAUGHAN, D.D., Head Master of Harrow School, &c. London: Murray.

WE have been most favourably impressed by the tone and the substance of all that we have read of this volume of discourses.

There is a reality about them, and an affectionate solicitude for the highest interests of the young persons to whom they were addressed, which fills us with respect for the author. His observations on party spirit and its evils are peculiarly appropriate, and his warnings on the subject of scepticism are not less so. Violent and overstrained disputes on philosophical and religious questions generally lead to the rise of a sceptical and latitudinarian party. The reaction from puritanism led to infidelity in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

xix.—*Scripture Biography. By the Rev. ROBERT WILSON EVANS, B.D., Vicar of Heversham, &c. Third Series. London: Rivingtons.*

A MORE pleasing work than this for perusal in devout families cannot well be imagined. It combines so much of the biographical form, with the inculcation of sound moral and religious teaching that the attention is kept alive, and both pleasure and improvement will be reaped by the student. Much illustration is derived from the author's knowledge on cognate topics, and we need not recommend to our readers the tone of the work as delightful—for it is sufficient to remind them of the "Rectory of Valehead."

xx.—*Pilgrimages to St. Mary of Walsingham and St. Thomas of Canterbury. By DESIDERIUS ERASMUS. Newly translated, with the Colloquy of Rash Vows, by the same Author, &c. By JOHN GOUGH NICHOLS, F.S.A. Westminster: J. B. Nichols & Son.*

THIS volume possesses more than an antiquarian interest. It brings before the English readers the superstitions which were customary in this country before the Reformation, and which are still continued in Italy and in other countries under the dominion of Romanism. The superstitions practised at the shrine of St. Mary of Walsingham, or of St. Thomas à Becket, are exactly parallel to those which Mr. Seymour has ably described in his "Pilgrimage to Rome." Mr. Nichols has added copious annotations, exhibiting extensive research and antiquarian knowledge, and the volume is, on the whole, not only a curious, but a valuable and useful one.

xxi.—*The Diaconate and the Poor. The Duty of the Laity of England briefly considered, with reference to the above Two Objects. By a PARISH PRIEST. London: Ollivier.*

THE object of this publication is to urge the revival of the

office of Deacon, in connexion with the Offertory, for the purpose of relieving the poor and afflicted. The notion is a noble one, and we heartily wish it were taken up in such quarters as might lead to a hope of its being realized. There is one difficulty that strikes us—the hard-hearted and covetous who form so large a portion of the community, and who possess the greatest portion of its wealth, would be exempt from contributing to the relief of the poor.—This would be, in our view, a decided evil. We extract the following passages from this publication, as illustration of its design :—

“ Before the middle of the sixteenth century there had never been a Poor Law in England. Nearly 1000 years had passed since S. Augustine planted our Church, and, during the whole of that time, a compulsory maintenance of the poor had never been needed or required. Through the dynasty of Saxon and Norman, though the most salutary and excellent laws that now govern us had been passed, the principle had been maintained and acted on, that to the Church, and not to the State, belonged the care and guardianship of the poor. For nearly 1000 years our Church possessed this *visible* mark of belonging to Christ. Cannot then the early Christian Church, as the guardian of the poor, be taken as a model for a large and flourishing nation? For 1000 years the poor in England lived, and were hospitably kept, on the tithes, alms, and offerings of the Church.

“ By the 14 Eliz. the compulsory maintenance of the poor *first* came into existence.

“ Nor did the government willingly take the poor under its charge subsequently to the Reformation. The State rulers had taken indeed the Church's property, but they denied its responsibilities. They left the poor to starve and die. The vital principle of Christian charity had declined before the Reformation: that event, and the frightful religious strife that arose upon it, well-nigh extinguished what was left. The old funds were gone; the eternal imperishable doctrine was gone too; what was to become of the poor? They wandered about till they perished from hunger; in their desperation they took up arms for bread: they were then hanged and shot. At length, in Elizabeth's time, the government were forced to grant the expediency—infidel—Poor Law.

“ Thus, in the sixteenth century, our Church lost her property and her poor; but before that, she had lost the vital living doctrine, and this loss led to the other. A long sore bondage have we since served to mammon. When shall our *visibility* be again manifested, and our lost jewels be recovered? *Then*, when the lay members of the Church shall honestly endeavour to recover unto the Church her poor; *to substitute in the place of mere secular enactments, the law of the Christian Church.*

The author thus remarks on the practical disuse of the office

of Deacon, though the form of Ordination to that office is still preserved :—

“ By a singular providence the form has been diligently used. Year after year, season after season, the ceremony has been performed in our cathedrals, but from that holy consecrating service there have come forth no ministers for the bodily wants of Christ's poor. The Church has continued nominally to appoint the officer, but the only deacons who have all the time walked our land have been the relieving officers and workhouse guardians of the State-expediency Poor Law.

“ A few words will demonstrate these positions. In the preface to the form for making deacons the qualification for the candidate is stated, that he ‘ be a man of virtuous conversation and without crime ; learned in the Latin tongue ; and sufficiently instructed in Holy Scripture.’ Then in the first rubric there is ordered ‘ a sermon, or exhortation, declaring the *duty and office* of such as come to be made deacons ; how necessary that order is to the Church of Christ : and how the people ought to esteem them in their office.’

“ I am not aware that this sermon on *the duty and office of Deacons* as such is ever preached ; and, indeed, at present it is better let alone ; there is great good sense in omitting it. But that the reformers intended a temporal rather than a spiritual office the whole service makes most manifest. The collect, after mentioning ‘ divers orders of ministers in the Church,’ speaks by name of S. Stephen and the others whom Apostles, under Divine influence, ordained Deacons, and then prays that ‘ God will mercifully behold those His servants who were then called to the *like* office and administration ;’ and that there might be no possible mistake about the nature of that office, one of the Epistles, which follows, is taken from the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in which we are told that the *express* object, nay the *only* object, for which the order was created was ‘ to serve tables.’

“ And, again, in the Bishop's charge to the Deacons, after he has spoken of their spiritual office, which is merely to *assist* the Priest, as a kind of Nethinim, in divine service, to read homilies and holy scriptures, and to teach the catechism ; but *not* to baptize except by necessity, or to preach except by license ; he adds, ‘ furthermore it is his office (where provision is so made) to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell unto the curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners or others.’

“ Not now to mention the other places in the office, in which the duty of the Deacon is clearly shown in the intention of the Church to be rather a temporal than a spiritual function, the last rubric is especially worthy of attention, from which it will be observed that the calling of the Deacons to the office of Priest at the end of one year is by no means a matter of necessary Church arrangement.

“ From these observations it will be seen that in the *theory* of our Church, the diaconate is something very distinct from the priesthood.

As the *first* duties of the *priesthood* are *spiritual*; so the *first* duties of the *diaconate* are *temporal*. But is it so in reality and practice? The ordination sermon never alludes to the peculiar and *distinctive* duties of the Deacons. The same educational qualifications, as University degrees, &c. are required by the bishops for the deacons as for the priests, as if none were to be admitted into the former order who might be allowed to continue it. Men are *called* to the like office and administration with Stephen and the others whom the Apostles ordained; but it is impossible they can *go* to it, where no provision for 'serving tables' is ever made. Moreover, Deacons newly-ordained are even allowed to take the entire spiritual charge of large and important parishes, where the Priest is either absent, or so infirm as to be unable to discharge his duties; and in many cases our services are ministered without the absolution.

"The Deacons themselves, as is most natural, where no effort has been made to teach them their duties, or to assign a special administration, confound their functions with the *priesthood*; and few indeed, if any, are they who continue voluntarily in the diaconate beyond the shortest time allowed by ecclesiastical law; so entirely is the order regarded not as a distinct and honourable office in itself, but as a sort of probationary priesthood. Practically, we repeat, there is no order of Deacons in our Church. Is it because we have no Christian charity left? It cannot be because we have no poor.

"Ten thousand Deacons, one for every parish, would not cost any thing like so much as 10,000 relieving officers. To make Christ's Church again visible, would be a saving to the nation, looking upon it in this low mercantile view; of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, compared with the maintenance of the present Poor Law. And surely our Church and nation could find 10,000 amongst her laymen who, without the qualifications for the higher order of the priesthood are, or could easily be made, fit for the Order of Deacons."

The following interesting facts, in regard to the Offertory, are mentioned in the Appendix:—

"The Isle of Man, with a population, in 1841, of 47,986 is not degraded and unchristianized by a poor law. There is a weekly offertory in every church in the island, and the poor are principally supported by the funds thus raised: this, too, in a place where, in other respects, Church doctrine is less distinctly recognized, and the Church itself is far less efficient than with us, and where, moreover, pecuniary means are less in ratio with the population.

"A plan exemplifying the principles advocated in this tract is also being carried out, with every prospect of complete and ultimate success, at W——— in ——shire; a very poor, and until the last two years entirely neglected and heathen place. The weekly offertory there, in the present year, has amounted to 40*l.*, and out of this a regular payment is made to the poor and sick amongst the communicants and

children unconfirmed, who attend the Church school. The population is composed (one family excepted) of colliers, hand-loom weavers, and small farmers."

XXII.—1. *Sister's Care. By the Author of "Michael the Chorister," "Rachel Ashburn." A Story of Real Life.*

2. *Harry and Archie; or, First and Last Communion. By the Rev. E. MONRO, M.A.*

3. *Self-Devotion; or, the Prussians at Hochkirch: a free translation from the German of Frederica Schwann. London: Masters.*

MANY little works of this nature does Mr. Masters send forth to the Christian world, and we are under no slight obligations to him for so doing. Mr. Monro's bold, and sometimes almost awful, allegories, are well known: they have, perhaps, more depth of meaning, and display more power of conception, than the very sweet creations of our departed brother, that faithful follower of Christ, the Rev. William Adams. "Harry and Archie" is very beautiful, and will no doubt command a large circulation. More touching, perhaps, is "Sister's Care;" a charming little tale, which we can heartily recommend as a school gift for the children of the poor. "Rachel Ashburn" we like less: it is needlessly rendered complicated and intricate, if not confused, by a very singular whim of its author, who has chosen to make the real tale a mere retrospective episode in history, though it occupies just thirty-four out of forty-four pages. This is obviously absurd, and would alone suffice to prevent our recommending the story for general circulation. We must add, that it seems rather void of purpose, and could be of no use in any case to children, and yet it is pretty in its way. The tale from the German is also by no means devoid of merit.

XXIII.—*Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine, in Reply to Mr. Newman's Essay. By the Rev. WILLIAM ARCHER BUTLER, M.A., &c. Edited by the Rev. THOMAS WOODWARD, M.A., &c. Dublin: Hodges and Smith.*

"DEVELOPMENT" has developed itself into oblivion, for no one ever hears of the doctrine or its author now. In fact, a doctrine which was very well in 1845, may, on the principle of development, be an obsolete one in 1850. It is certainly a very remarkable fact, how utterly the theory has sunk out of notice in the Church of England. Mr. Archer Butler's work, however, well merits a perusal for its literary and theological merit; and we

must again lament the early death of one of the brightest ornaments of the Irish Church.

XXIV.—*Sermons. By the Rev. HENRY HUGHES, M.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints, Gordon Square, &c. London: Rivingtons.*

THIS volume of Sermons which is dedicated to Sir Robert Inglis, a relative of the author, is vigorously and forcibly written, with much plainness of speech, and in a tone of manly and fervent piety. The Sermons are rather of the Evangelical school, but by no means an extreme specimen; and while earnest in their denunciation of formality in every shape, are affectionate in their tone as regards the Church, and the forms sanctioned by her. There is much in these discourses which must command general assent: they are decidedly practical.

XXV.—*A Manual of the British Marine Algæ: containing generic and specific Descriptions of all the known British Species of Sea-weeds. With Plates to illustrate all the Genera. By WILLIAM HENRY HARVEY, &c. London: Van Voorst.*

THIS is the second edition of a work on the same subject, published some time since by Professor Harvey, whose very able and interesting volume, "The Sea-side Book," we had occasion to notice in a former number. Dr. Harvey, in the volume before us, gives a descriptive catalogue of all the marine algæ to be found on the British shores, stating the characteristics of each plant, and the localities in which it has been found. The letter-press is followed by a series of very well executed engravings in illustration of the different genera; and the volume will be of course indispensable to all who wish to study the branch of science to which it relates, and which has but recently acquired the notice which it deserves and repays.

XXVI.—*The Jamaica Movement for the Promoting the Enforcement of the Slave Trade Treaties, &c. London: Gilpin.*

EVERY one who has any feeling of justice must sympathize with the efforts of the oppressed West Indians to obtain common justice from the Imperial Parliament. Their case is a cruel one; their property has been confiscated for the benefit of slave-holding states by the policy of a country which maintains an enormously expensive squadron on the coast of Africa to suppress slavery. But justice and consistency are not to be expected from a democracy, and therefore the unfortunate planters of Jamaica and the

West Indies, like the landlords of Ireland and the farmers of England, will be exterminated. Ere long we suppose the West Indies will fall into the hands of the United States, as they will not be worth this country's keeping, and they may then flourish once more.

XXVII.—*Westminster: Memorials of the City, St. Peter's College, the Parish Churches, Palaces, Streets, and Worthies. By the Rev. M. S. C. WALCOTT, M.A., &c. Westminster: Masters.*

THIS is one of those books that it is difficult to lay down, and which you may open at any part, and your attention is arrested. It is one of the most amusing topographical books we have seen, and does great credit to the research and industry of the writer.

The history of the Abbey is not included; but the antiquities of the churches, palaces, parliament houses, college, and all the various localities, are collected and told in a most interesting way, and we should presume that the accuracy of the work may be calculated on, as the author seems to have spared no pains or labour in its compilation. There are a few engravings of Westminster and its buildings in olden time.

XXVIII.—*The Resurrection of the Flesh.—Seven Lectures on the Fifteenth Chapter of the former Epistle to the Corinthians. By HENRY BOND BOWLBY, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, &c. London: Rivingtons.*

WE have been pleased with all we have read of this series of discourses on the lesson read at the Burial Service. They are explanatory and practical, and extremely well adapted to edify and instruct a congregation.

XXIX.—*Meditations on the suffering Life on Earth of our Lord and only Saviour. From the French of PINART. London: Masters.*

THIS work appears to be very carefully edited, so as to contain nothing except what may with pleasure and edification be perused by Churchmen. It is impossible to open the volume without being impressed by the tone of earnest and natural devotion in which it is written. The principal truths connected with our Lord's incarnation, and the series of events included in his passion, furnish subjects for the chapters, each of which is followed by a "Practical Resolution."

xxx.—*The Pilgrim's Hand-book; or Counsel and Comfort for the Wayfarers of Zion. Set forth by a PILGRIM.* London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

THE volume before us consists of a great variety of extracts from religious writers of different connexions, and of ancient and modern times, and while written with much piety and sincerity, is adapted for the use of persons of any religious denomination, no peculiarities being discernible. The author is one of those good persons who do not trouble themselves about controversies amongst Christians, but act on the principle of trusting to the "indwelling of the spirit in the heart."

xxxI.—*The Mercy Seat: Thoughts suggested by the Lord's Prayer.* By GARDINER SPRING, D.D., Pastor of Brick Presbyterian Church, in the City of New York. Edinburgh: J. and T. Clark.

WE are always glad to recognize and to sympathize with religious earnestness in different communions from our own; and Dr. Spring is a writer to whom such praise is especially due. It is lamentable to think, in perusing volumes such as this, how much causeless division exists in the nominally Christian world; for we really often peruse sermons and other writings by Presbyterians and Dissenters, which harmonize far better with the Church of England, than do those of some of her actual members; and we should not be at all sorry to exchange the one against the other, if the transfer were possible. In the case of Dr. Spring, however, we regret that there is one material obstacle: he objects to all set forms of prayers, and argues stoutly against them.

xxxII.—*Sermons for the Sundays and principal Holy-days throughout the Year.* By the Rev. Lord ARTHUR HERVEY, A.M., Rector of Ickworth, &c. 2 vols. London: Hatchards.

THESE are really good, plain, practical discourses, preached to, and well adapted for country congregations. They are composed in a fluent and easy style, and avoid controverted questions, dealing as much as possible in the general doctrines received by all Churchmen.

xxxIII.—*The Church Schoolmaster.* By the Rev. SANDERSON ROBINS, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THE object of this excellent work is to supply hints to schoolmasters on the leading points of their duties, and the course of

conduct which they should pursue in order to accomplish the great objects of their office. There is much practical wisdom in the suggestions offered in these pages, which we commend to the especial attention of all who are interested in National Schools.

XXXIV.—*An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Pentateuch.* By H. A. CH. HÄVERNICK, *Doctor and Professor of Theology in the University of Königsberg.* Translated by ALEX. THOMSON, A.M., *Professor of Biblical Literature, Glasgow Theological Academy.* Edinburgh: Clark.

It is, without doubt, very laudable and commendable, in men like Dr. Hävernicks, to undertake the defence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, a point which, as the translator remarks, has been "so much debated of late in Germany." We are glad to find that there are some persons still remaining in Germany who are willing to uphold the truth of the Mosaic records. But how fearful a state of things it is, when such questions can be freely discussed at all. Is nothing to be settled? Are men to be at liberty to discuss every thing—even to the existence of God? It is so in the Evangelical Church in Germany, and the State is endeavouring to make it so in the Church of England; and such will certainly be the event in England, if the State is not compelled to keep aloof from the Church. Dr. Hävernicks appears to have executed his melancholy work with fidelity and learning. But who can make men believe, if they do not wish to submit their reason to any authority?

XXXV.—*Occasional Sermons, preached in Westminster Abbey.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., *Canon of Westminster.* London: Rivingtons.

THE author of this volume is ever ready to engage in the cause of the Church of England; and the learning, ability, and courage which he brings to the aid of any cause which he undertakes, are too well known to require any remarks from us. The object of the Sermons before us (which were published separately) was, to supply an antidote to the danger of secession from the Church, arising from the recent decision of the Privy Council in the Gorham case. With this view, Dr. Wordsworth urges that the doctrine of the Church of England is unchanged by that decision, as we have ourselves urged; and he shows how plainly and distinctly our formularies teach the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and how vain are all pretences to the contrary. In addition to this, he shows how the inherent efficacy of our formularies

brought about the suppression of the Arian heresy in the early part of the last century. Dr. Wordsworth does not appear to look to the assembling of Convocation with any confidence as a means of settling our present controversies ; but he does not express any adverse opinion. On the whole, the impression conveyed by his Sermons is, that we should remain satisfied with our present position, and that no efforts are requisite to effect an alteration in the existing relations of Church and State. Condemning the decision, he holds that it will not materially affect the Church. We cannot concur in this view, because the case of Evangelicalism and Neologianism now is not parallel to that of Arianism in 1711, in our opinion ; and because the State, and the temper of the times, have widely altered in 140 years. The evil now is, that men of heretical, and even infidel, opinions will gain legal footing in the Church, and that the State will appoint them Bishops and Deans.

xxxvi.—1. *A Plea for Peace. A Charge delivered at his Primary Visitation. By R. B. HONE, M.A., Archdeacon of Worcester.* London : Parker.

2. *Dangers to Truth from Controversy and Agitation. A Visitation Sermon. By the Hon. and Rev. W. H. LYTTLTON, Rector of Hagley, &c.* London : Parker.

3. *A Sermon on John iii. 5, in reference to the case of Gorham v. The Bishop of Exeter. By E. A. LITTON, M.A., &c.* London : Hatchards.

SOME parties in the diocese of Worcester appear to have been rather annoyed at the success of what they call “agitation,” in obtaining from the clergy of the diocese an expression of opinion on the Baptismal controversy. We are aware, from the public journals, that the Bishop of Worcester was adverse to any such movement ; and Archdeacon Hone, in his Charge, regrets that he himself had not had an opportunity of denouncing it. Mr. Lyttelton, too, is in great tribulation. We can feel for these excellent men. It is, indeed, most distressing to observe that the clergy of Worcester are inclined to think for themselves ; and that if they are of opinion that faith is in danger, they have actually the audacity to say so—though their Bishop and Archdeacon would wish them to be silent ! We live in *strange* times, indeed, when the clergy appear to have consciences, and to *act* on them ! Archdeacon Hone’s suggestion, that the laity, in their “giant-power,” should come forward, will not mend the matter ; it will only add to the agitation which he is so anxious to see at an end.

For no one can oblige men to cease from expressing their opinion, if they hold faith to be endangered; and those who think so will not dread *any* power on earth. Mr. Litton's Sermon is a well-written defence of the decision of the Committee of Council.

XXXVII.—*Sermons on the New Birth of Man's Nature.* By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. London: Murray.

THESE discourses deserve a far more lengthened survey and notice than we can at this moment afford to them. To say that they are replete with sound and deep theology—that they are worthy of the author's reputation as one of our most distinguished divines—would convey an imperfect, though not untrue impression of their merits. Though it might, perhaps, be supposed, from the title, that the volume was written with express reference to the controversy now pending, such a notion would be a mistaken one, the expressions employed in the title being used in the largest sense, though the privileges of Christian baptism are continually kept in view. It is, in fact, a volume of discourses on subjects connected with the exaltation of humanity through the Incarnation, and amongst the rest, on the principal Festivals of the Church, and the mysteries thus commemorated.

XXXVIII.—*Eruvin; or, Miscellaneous Essays on Subjects connected with the Nature, History, and Destiny of Man.* By the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., &c. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons.

EVERY one who is acquainted with this ingenious work of Dr. Maitland will be glad to see a reprint of it in the neat volume before us.

XXXIX.—*Sermons, University and Parochial.* By EDWARD THOMAS VAUGHAN, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, &c. London: Rivingtons.

A BETTER style of sermon-writing appears to us to be growing up of late. We have less of the mere religious-essay style than formerly; and Mr. Vaughan's discourses are good specimens of this improvement. They are thoughtful, and yet practical; and quite sufficiently animated and interesting. Our attention has been attracted more particularly to two discourses on Baptism, in which great truths are maintained, while all who hold those truths may not entirely concur in the views which accompany them. We have read them with pleasure.

XI.—*The Age: being a Letter to a Society for the Improvement of Sacred Architecture, &c.* By a LAYMAN. London: Hatchards.

THIS "Layman" is evidently a very worthy and well-meaning man, but is a sadly long-winded one. His book is nominally to give some advice to Ecclesiastical Antiquarians, but after a few words to them, he runs off into endless talkification about every matter under the sun, going on steadily, without so much as the break or intermission of a fresh chapter, in one dreary outpouring of twaddle and truism. We should be sorry to have a button within reach of this "Layman," for we should never get away from him.

XLI.—*In Memoriam.* London: Moxon.

THIS little volume contains a series of poems in the same measure, which make up a whole, and they are in memory of a departed object of affection. There is a tone of melancholy music throughout, and a calm, sad reflection, which speaks of reality, and engages the sympathy of the reader. It is the tribute of a wife to her husband. We extract the following passage, not as the best in the volume, but as showing the kind of subjects on which it dwells.

"Thy converse drew as with delight
The men of rathe and riper years :
The feeble soul, a haunt of fears,
Forgot his weakness in thy sight.

"On thee the loyal-hearted hung,
The proud were half disarm'd of pride,
Nor cared the serpent at thy side
To flicker with his treble tongue.

"The stern were mild when thou wert by,
The flippant put himself to school
And heard thee, and the brazen fool
Was softened, and he knew not why ;

"While I, thy dearest, sat apart,
And felt thy triumph was as mine ;
And loved them more, that they were thine,
The graceful tact, the Christian art ;

"Not mine the sweetness or the skill,
But mine the love that will not tire,
And, born of love, the vague desire
That spurs an imitative will."

There is a truthfulness about this volume that renders it extremely touching.

XLII.—*A Result of Meditation on the Bible, or an Inquiry into Truth.* By a LAYMAN. Brighton: Henry S. King.

THERE is much in this volume which we have read with pleasure. The writer is a very serious, sober-minded inquirer, quite of the old school, and valuing piety wherever he may meet it. His authorities, however, are to a considerable extent evangelical, where they indicate any particular religious views. There is nothing calling for very particular remark in this work. We have no doubt that where it is read, it will be valued.

XLIII.—*Letters in Vindication of the Church of Ireland; addressed to an English Member of Parliament.* By the Rev. J. M. MAGUIRE, B.A., Vicar of Boyle, &c. London: Rivingtons.

THE volume before us is one of the most valuable, as bearing on the case of the Church of Ireland, that we have ever seen. We have perused with pain the records of the injustice of the State to the Irish Church, and with pleasure the vindication of that Church's position. In Ireland the State policy had full play for a long series of years. The Sovereign appointed to bishoprics, without even the intervention of a nominal election, and it gradually destroyed the Church. Bishoprics were the bribes of political services. Even now, the patronage of the State in Ireland is unblushingly and openly employed for the purpose of breaking down the principles of the Church. The latitudinarian system of education established by the State, was condemned by the whole Church of Ireland, with scarcely a dissentient voice. Government appoints no one to bishoprics or other benefices, who will not declare himself in opposition to the sentiments of his Church! The conduct of the State to the Church in Ireland, is characterized by the same obstinate determination to carry out its latitudinarianism, as it has shown in England; and it must be confronted with equal obstinacy. We will only add, that the Church of Ireland will never gain any thing by meekness and submissiveness. They have to deal with a foe who only contemns them for obedience and quietness, and rejoices to think that they are tied down by their connexion with the State, and can only complain. We would advise the Church of Ireland to show something of the energy of the Church of England in seeking for their *liberties*, and then they will perhaps have less reason to complain of want of sympathy at this side of the Channel.

LIV.—*Deeds of Faith : Stories for Children from Church History.* By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A. London: Mozley.

A VERY pleasing collection of tales, some of them of rather legendary description, relating remarkable instances of the powers of Christian faith in various ages. Mr. Neale excels in compositions of this kind.

CLV.—*Holy Men of Old : being short notices of such as are named in the Calendar of the English Church.* London: Mozley.

THE notices are very short certainly, but perhaps they are not the worse for that, for in very many cases there are not many authentic details recorded in history. On the whole it is a well written and interesting volume.

XLVI.—*Sketches of Character ; and other pieces in Verse.* By ANNA H. POTTS. Cambridge: University Press.

WE are afraid we cannot speak very highly of these poems, though there is some cleverness in them. We extract part of the first as a specimen.

“Husbands indeed ! Nay urge not again,
Not always may friendship's bright fancies expand ;
But few can we sketch of this large class of men,
Who from woman, love, honour, obedience demand !
The first is a clever but very vain man,
The envied young lady he takes for his bride,
Though she loves him too truly his follies to fan,
Will quietly learn her own talents to hide ;
For he thinks in her sex, the bright gifts of the mind,
Are best to the depths of oblivion consign'd.”

And to those “depths of oblivion” we much fear Anna H. Potts' poems will be “consigned” likewise.

XLVII.—*Letters and Memoir of the late Walter Augustus Shirley, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man.* Edited by THOMAS HILL, B.D., Archdeacon of Derby. London: Hatchards.

DR. SHIRLEY appears to have been a very good and earnest clergyman, and his parochial labours were highly successful; he was also a useful and efficient archdeacon; and thus possessed more qualifications for the office of bishop than can always be shown. His views were rather evangelical. He had only just been consecrated when he was carried off by a sudden attack of illness, to

the great grief of his friends. Dr. Shirley would have been a blessing to the Diocese of Sodor and Man, if his life had been spared, for such sincerity and earnestness as his, and so much substantial and real piety, even though tinged in some degree with prejudices, could not have failed to draw down a blessing on his labours.

XLVIII.—*Liber Precum Publicarum, etc.* Londini: J. W. Parker.

A VERY neat and well printed edition of the Latin Prayer Book, apparently well edited.

XLIX.—*Sermons, By the late Rev. JAMES COWLES PRICHARD, Vicar of Mitcham, Surrey, &c., with a Memoir.* London: Masters.

THE lamented author of these discourses was a very earnest and promising young clergyman, who was taken from us less than two years ago. His "Life and Times of Hincmar" has been already noticed in this Review as a work of unusual merit, and the pious and thoughtful sermons before us, prove the efficacy of his pulpit ministrations. They are quite those of a Churchman.

L.—*The Parson's Home: a Poem. By an ENGLISH VICAR.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS poem contains many pleasing descriptions of rural life and feelings, and exhibits a degree of poetical power much like that of the generality of prize poems. The versification is good, the imagery unexceptionable, and the classical allusions frequent. It is altogether a very readable volume, without any extraordinary amount of poetical power.

LI.—*The Judgments on Baptismal Regeneration, &c. By W. J. IRONS, B.D., Vicar of Brompton.* London: Masters.

AN able and thoughtful publication, comprising the various documents of importance which have recently appeared in connexion with the Gorham case, and evincing a full appreciation of the depth of peril now surrounding the faith of the Church, and the imperative necessity of *action* in consequence.

LII.—*An Exposition of the Creed by John Pearson, D.D., Bishop of Chester. Revised and Corrected by the Rev. TEMPLE CHEVALLIER, B.D.* Cambridge: University Press; London: J. W. Parker.

AN accurate and beautiful edition of Pearson on the Creed. All

he references have been carefully collated, and the work is here, we suppose, presented in the most perfect form it is capable of.

LIII.—*An Arctic Voyage to Baffin's Bay and Lancaster Sound, in Search of Friends with Sir John Franklin. By ROBERT ANSTRUTHER GOODSIR, late President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh.* London: Van Voorst.

THE author of this little volume is one of those whose relatives have taken part in the expedition under Sir John Franklin; and, in the hope of hearing some tidings of a brother who had embarked in that expedition in 1845, he joined, as a medical man, a whaler, commanded by Mr. William Penney, and in March, 1849, sailed from Stromness for the Arctic Regions; from whence he returned, after a voyage of eight months, and has since, as we learn from the Preface, joined in one of the expeditions recently dispatched in pursuit of the missing ships of Sir J. Franklin. The little volume before us is written with a freedom and a *bonhomie* peculiarly pleasing. We are not aware that it throws any new light on the subjects of which it treats, but the descriptions of scenery, of the habits of the natives, and of the whale fishery, are extremely good and spirited. The last mentioned subject affords considerable scope for the pen, and is generally the most exciting we find in works descriptive of Northern voyages; but in this volume the descriptions of perils on the ice, including the crushing and destruction of ships, divide the interest. We do not remember any where to have read more vigorous and graphic description of the "sport" of killing whales, in which there is certainly adventure enough to satisfy any amount of craving. We have no doubt that those descriptions will afford the highest gratification to all persons who are fond of such diversions; and the evident feelings of triumph with which the author details the success of the warfare waged against the whales, are precisely those of a sportsman. We confess that the whole process appears to us something like butchery; and we should be sorry to be one of those who could make up their minds to harpoon a whale which left itself exposed to danger and death, from maternal affection to its "calf," or young one; of which we have an instance recorded in this volume. We suppose such feelings are very unreasonable, but we should think that many of our readers must have experienced them ere now in perusing accounts of the whale fishery, even while they may have admired the courage and dexterity of the harpooners and others engaged.

LIV.—*An Elementary Course of Geology, Mineralogy, and Physical Geography.* By DAVID T. ANSTED, M.A., F.R.S., &c., Professor of Geology in King's College, London. London: Van Voorst.

MR. ANSTED is already so well known to the public as one of our most eminent scientific men, and more especially for his admirable work on Geology—the best, we believe, on the subject—that his name is a sufficient recommendation to any thing that may proceed from his pen.

The work before us is one of the most comprehensive nature: it comprises an elementary course of instruction in Physical Geography, Mineralogy, and Geology, extensively illustrated by wood-cuts. The first part of this work comprises a Treatise on Physical Geography; in which the author considers the subject of Matter generally, and especially the mechanical condition and properties of the substances found near the surface of the earth; the focus of attraction and repulsion; light, heat, and electricity; the form and density of the earth; distribution of waters, rivers, mountains; currents in the atmosphere and sea; changes in the earth's crust, by alterations in temperature, and by the reaction of the interior of the earth through volcanoes, earthquakes, &c.; change of level; elevation of some parts of the earth, and depression of others.

He next proceeds to Mineralogy, arranged under the heads of crystallography; characteristics of simple minerals, of non-metallic simple minerals, and of metals and ores.

“Descriptive Geology” commences with an examination of the different species of rocks, and their formation; then proceeds to stratification and mechanical displacement of rocks, their classification, and the distribution of organic remains, together with their value in determining the relative ages of rocks. The rocks and fossils of the tertiary period, and of the secondary epoch, and those of the palæozoic period, are successively examined; after which, the connexion of geology with agriculture, engineering, and architecture is traced; and the Appendix contains a series of examination papers in mineralogy and geology, some description of the geology of India, with an excellent Index.

That so great an amount of scientific discussion should be included within 600 small pages, is a proof of the condensation to which Mr. Ansted has subjected his matter throughout. To students his work will be invaluable; and we can have no doubt that it will obtain the extensive circulation which it so well deserves.

LV.—*A Treatise on the Climate and Meteorology of Madeira.*
By the late J. H. MASON, M.D., Inventor of Mason's Hygrometer.
Edited by J. S. KNOWLES. London: Churchill.

THE great value of this work will be its utility as a guide to those whose health obliges them to seek a warmer climate. It comprises a series of observations by a medical man, and by others, on the climate, temperature, &c., of Madeira; in short, all that kind of information which is most important to patients and to physicians to acquire. It would appear that the persons who visit Madeira for health, are led to undertake excursions for the purpose of viewing the very remarkable scenery of the island, which frequently have the effect of preventing them from deriving the benefit they might otherwise have experienced from a residence there; and they do not seem to be aware that there are changes of temperature at Madeira as well as in England, and that it is requisite to act accordingly. To the general reader the greater part of this work, comprising observations and tables, will not be very interesting; but there is a very curious chapter by Dr. Peacock, Dean of Ely, on the tenure of land in Madeira, and the tenant right there established, which virtually amounts to giving tenants perpetual possession on paying a certain portion of the produce to the landlord. The working of this system appears to hold out no stimulus to industry, and the lands at Madeira appear to be wretchedly cultivated, and the landlords bankrupt. There is a well written and amusing tour of Madeira in the latter part of the volume, by Mr. Driver, making an excellent guide book.

LVI.—*Plain Parish Sermons, preached at Rotherhithe.* By the
Rev. PHILIP BLAND, B.A., Curate of St. Mary's Church.
 London: Wertheim and Mackintosh.

THERE is a great temptation to young men in the ministry to gain attention by startling modes of expression. We are afraid Mr. Bland has yielded to this temptation. His Sermons are *plain* enough, but they lack propriety: for instance, at p. 178, he speaks rather contemptuously of the three Creeds, where he says of a certain text, "I do not hesitate to say, though composed two hundred years before Christ, it is a very *much better*, a much more Christian Creed than any of the three in our Prayer Book, which was written after Christ had been upon earth; but of which several parts are written in a sadly hostile and invidious spirit towards other parties; many of whom, there is no doubt, were much better Christians than their self-styled orthodox oppo-

nents. This, however, is not the place, neither is this the time, to compare the early creed in the text with the later ones, which we find in our Prayer Book; which yet, of course, are quite open to have their merits discussed, *and their faults exposed*, as being human compositions, and therefore, at best, very much inferior to the simple word of God." This is something like "speaking out." Mr. Bland is evidently a candidate for a Bishopric, and such are the men who are now being appointed Bishops and Deans. To attack the Creeds, and sneer at *orthodoxy* is now the certain and infallible mode of gaining favourable notice from the State.

L.VII.—*Letters to my Children on Moral Subjects.* By the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. London: Cleaver.

AN excellent series of moral instructions, entering into all those details which comprise the great difficulties of most minds in youth.

L.VIII.—*Common Sense versus Common Law.* By WILLIAM MASSEY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. London: Longmans.

EVERY one has heard of the "glorious uncertainty" of the law, even if he has not experienced it. Mr. Massey takes the law to pieces, and shows the cause of its uncertainty, and not unfrequent injustice; and he appears to understand his subject perfectly well.

L.IX.—*A Plea for the faithful Restoration of our ancient Churches, &c.* By GEORGE GILBERT SCOTT, Architect. London: J. H. Parker.

MR. SCOTT speaks with right feeling and right principle on the faithful restoration of our old Churches; and yet there is nothing overstrained or absurd in his recommendations. Novelty should, as far as possible, be eschewed in Church restorations; we mean, such novelty as amounts to material alterations in the character and style of the building, or the removal of ancient characteristics, as a general rule.

L.X.—*Three Advent Sermons; and a Pastor's Address on the Twentieth Anniversary of his Incumbency.* By EDWARD B. RAMSAY, M.A., Dean of Edinburgh. London: Rivingtons.

A VOLUME containing much sound and sober-minded teaching, in which the author appears anxious to trace his way between extremes in all directions, to which he is evidently very averse.

LXI.—*The Influence of the Hebrew and Christian Revelations on Ancient Heathen Writers. (Hulsean Prize Essay for 1849.)* By SAMUEL TOMKINS, of St. Catharine's Hall. Cambridge: Deighton.

A VERY able and well written work, affording indications of much promise. We are glad to see in the writer another advocate of Christianity in opposition to the speculations of German Infidelity.

LXII.—*Prayers and Rules for the Ordering and Use of a Church Guild. With Remarks on Ancient Guilds.* London: Masters.

MANY persons, on perusing this little book, might be disposed to regard the proposal of establishing Church Guilds as a matter undeserving of consideration. We do not concur in such a view; and although it may be possible that every part of the scheme here proposed would not be found beneficial, we should be glad to hear how such institutions work; for it is very easy to put forward plans, but not always easy to carry them into execution.

LXIII.—*Guardian Angels. A sacred Allegory.* By MARY N. LESTER. London: Masters.

A VERY pleasingly written allegory. The "Guardian Angels" are Faith, Hope, and Charity, who conduct a band of baptized Christians towards heaven.

LXIV.—*Phases of Faith; or, Passages from the History of my Creed.* By FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN, formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Chapman.

THAT such books as this should be published with impunity,—that gross and direct blasphemy, equal to that of any of the Encyclopedists, should be obtruded on the public, is a sufficient sign of the spread of infidelity; and a warning to Christians of the necessity of taking measures for the security of the Faith. Unbelievers like Mr. Newman may well hate the creeds and formularies of the Church. He calls for the abolition of creeds. So do all the Rationalists and heretics of the day; and this is what the State will do ere long, if the Church does not resolutely assert her liberty, and shake off the bondage of an unbelieving State.

LXV.—*God in Christ. Three Discourses, delivered at New Haven, Cambridge, and Andover, &c.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. London: Chapman.

MR. HORACE BUSHNELL is one of those persons who are very much grieved at the dogmatism of Christians, and particularly in

America, where Puritanism has given birth to all kinds of monstrosities in religion. He suggests to his brethren the expediency of relaxing adherence to their creeds and confessions of faith, in order to promote unity. So that Puritanism has come to this—that although it would not relax in such matters as a surplice or a Prayer Book, it is now called on, after two hundred and fifty years of trial, to relax its *faith*! Surely the judgment of God on causeless divisions is evident here. Mr. Bushnell is a believer in some of the chief doctrines of Christianity; but his system is that of letting any one deny them that pleases, and yet recognizing him as a Christian brother.

LXVI.—*Evening Thoughts.* By a PHYSICIAN. London: Van Voorst.

FROM all we have seen of this work, we have reason to express a very favourable opinion of it. In these days we must look with some degree of anxiety on philosophical views of religion; but in the volume before us, we are happy to see that philosophy is made, as it ought to be, “the handmaid of Theology.” This physician has happily not reasoned himself out of the Christian faith.

LXVII.—*A Critical History of the Language and Situation of Ancient Greece.* By WILLIAM MURE, of Caldwell. London: Longmans.

THREE volumes of this learned and elaborate work are now before us, but the mass of criticism which they comprise, renders it hopeless for us to attempt at present to do more than state, that they form a portion of a complete literary history of Greece; the first two volumes being devoted to the early history of the language, and to Homer and Hesiod chiefly; the third to the lyric poets, and the early history of writing. Mr. Mure must contemplate an extensive work, when it is remembered what portion of Greek literature still remains to be criticized.

LXVIII.—*Apocalyptic Sketches or Lectures on the Seven Churches of Asia Minor.* By the Rev. J. CUMMING, D.D., &c. London: Hall, Virtue, and Co.

THIS series of Discourses is just suited for delivery in London, to a congregation made up partly of professing members of other communions, attracted by curiosity, or Dr. Cumming's power as a preacher. They are doctrinal, practical, and latitudinarian: the object before such preachers always being, to lay down such principles as may enable persons of all denominations to attend their ministry, without feeling that they are doing wrong in leaving their own Churches.

LXIX.—*Sermons.* By HENRY ALFORD, B.D., Vicar of Wymeswold, &c. London: Rivingtons.

A THOUGHTFUL and excellent volume of Sermons.

LXX.—*An Apology for the Septuagint, in which its Claims to Biblical and Canonical Authority are briefly stated and vindicated.* By E. W. GRINFIELD, M.A., &c. London: Pickering.

MR. GRINFIELD in this work argues that a species of inspiration must have guided the translators of the Septuagint. His position is maintained with much learning and speciousness, but we confess ourselves not convinced.

LXXI.—*Essays: Political, Historical, and Miscellaneous.* By ARCHIBALD ALISON, LL.D., &c. Edinburgh: Blackwoods, Vol. I.

FEW men in the present day have beheld the fate and prospects of the country with a more firm and vigorous grasp of intellect than the eminent author of the "History of Europe." These Essays evince the forethought of their writer. The nation however, or its rulers, have held a different view, and will adhere obstinately to it, according to all appearances. We can therefore only look for gradual ruin.

LXXII.—*Translation of Herman Venema's inedited Institutes of Theology.* By the Rev. ALEX. W. BROWN, Minister of Free St. Bernard's Church, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Clark.

WHO "Free St. Bernard" was, we know not; but the Incumbent of his Church has translated a very sound book, quite in the old orthodox style, *i. e.* as much so as could be expected from a Dutchman, as we imagine Venema to have been.

LXXIII.—*The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry (the Third Year), Harmonized: with Reflections.* By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., &c. London: Rivingtons.

THIS is the conclusion of Mr. Williams's Harmony of the Gospel Narrative, and is characterized by the same excellencies as the preceding volumes. It is rich in illustration from the writings of the Fathers and other eminent Commentators.

LXXIV.—*Jesus the Giver and the Fulfiller of the New Law. A Course of Eight Sermons on the Beatitudes, &c.* By the Rev. ALEX. WATSON, M.A., &c. London: Masters.

WE have to thank Mr. Watson for this eloquent and able series of Discourses, setting forth the great doctrines of the Gospel, without fear or compromise.

MISCELLANEOUS.

WE have to acknowledge the receipt of many publications which it is impossible to notice as they deserve at this moment. Mr. Neale's "*History of the Holy Eastern Church*," in 2 vols., is replete with matter of the highest interest, but we must reserve a notice of it for our next publication. Amongst architectural publications we have to speak in high terms of commendation of Mr. Sharpe's "*Decorative Window Tracery*," (Van Voorst,) as amongst the most valuable and useful publications we have seen, and very beautifully illustrated. Mr. Freeman, in his "*Essay on the Origin and Development of Window Tracery in England*," (Oxford: J. H. Parker,) has broken ground on the same subject, and with great success. His design is larger than that of Mr. Sharpe.

We must now turn to the shoal of minor publications bearing on the present controversy, and the subjects connected with it. Amongst these we must first mention Dr. Mill's Sermon before the University of Cambridge (Deighton), as an able vindication of sound principle in opposition to the latitudinarianism of the Privy Council. "*Contending for the Faith*," a Sermon by Mr. Anderdon, (Masters,) and excellent in its way. "*A Voice from the North*," Nos. I. and II., (Masters,) a vigorous protest against laxity, and the production of a writer who is quite alive to the exigencies of the times, and equal to them. Two Sermons on Baptism, by the Rev. C. C. Bartholomew, of St. David's, Exeter, (Masters,) exactly in the right spirit. "*Failing in the Faith*," by Mr. Case, of Margaret Chapel, a title unfortunately applicable to the writer. "*A Plea for the Church of England*," by Mr. Worgan, (Rivingtons,) most excellent, asserting the rights of the Church in the right way. "*The Controversy of Faith—Advice to Candidates for Holy Orders*," by Mr. Dodgson (Murray); a sound and orthodox view of the Gorham case, rather disinclined, however, to any synodical action of the Church at present, as scarcely fitted for it. We see difficulties and perils as Mr. Dodgson does, but we think there is no alternative; for it is impossible to let things remain as they are. "*Church and State*," reprinted from the last number of the "*Christian Remembrancer*" (Mozley); a very well-timed publication, distinctly pointing out the altered position of the Church through the transfer of the supremacy to a body of men without creed. "*Stand fast in the Faith*," a Sermon by the Curate of Stoke Damerel (Masters); very faithful to the Church, and in all respects worthy of praise. "*Our Present Duties in regard to Holy Baptism*," a Sermon by the Rev. T. L. Claughton (Rivingtons); an able, honest, and eloquent discourse. "*A*

Letter to all Members of the Church of England," &c., by Mr. Watson, of Cheltenham, (Masters,) is a plain and forcible tract addressed to the people, and pointing out the doctrine of the Church in opposition to the Gorham heresy. "A Third Letter to the Right Hon. Sir George Grey," by the Rev. W. H. Hoare, (Rivingtons,) in continuation of the Letters noticed elsewhere in this number, and treating of the Baptismal Controversy in a very pleasing tone. We agree with Mr. Hoare that the two parties, to a great extent, hold views which might be harmonized; but this ought to be done by authority of the Church, and extravagant assertions and heresies forbidden. All will be confusion till this is done. "A Brief Vindication of Jewel, Hooker," &c., by a Fellow of a College, (Rivingtons,) is a clear and thorough exposure of the false quotations in the judgment in *re* Gorham. "The Scottish Magazine," No. xxviii., contains some remarks on the Gorham case, urging the imperative necessity of the Church of England's immediate exertion to reverse the judgment of the Privy Council.

On the other side of the question we have "The Present Crisis of the Church," by Dr. Hook, (Murray,) rather in favour of the decision of the Committee of Council, and only apprehensive of Romanism, which, indeed, appears to have been for some years the only error on which Dr. Hook looks with alarm. "The Trials of the Church, a quickening of her Zeal and Love," two Sermons by the Rev. J. S. M. Anderson, &c. (Rivingtons.) These discourses are intended for the purpose of retaining persons in the Church, but they amount to a justification of the Privy Council. "The Duty of Christian Subjection," by the Rev. James Brogden, M.A., (Hatchards,) is, in fact, an assertion of the highest claims ever made for State supremacy when the State was orthodox, on behalf of the present unbelieving State. "A House divided against itself," by Mr. Dodsworth (Masters); "The Royal Supremacy," by T. W. Allies (Pickering); "Letters on the Present Position of the High Church Party," by Mr. Maskell, (Pickering,) are all in the same spirit. They are the publications of men who have been driven into alienation from the Church by the tyranny of the State, and who appear to despair of the cause of the Church. We think that real loyalty to the Church and to her Divine Head would rather lead men to co-operate for the removal, at all hazards, of the evils now seen to be oppressing us, than to relinquish the struggle at the very beginning of it. Let us hope better and nobler things from all who really *do* love the English Church. Let them not desert the good cause, but urge it on with all their hearts, and without permitting doubts and fears

to influence them. "A Few Words on the Spirit in which Men are meeting the present Crisis of the Church," by the Rev. E. Monro, (J. H. Parker,) is a well-meant publication, but one which is calculated to do harm, in persuading men to abstain from the only methods of action by which the Church can now be protected. There are many disadvantages and evils in voluntary combinations, but nothing else will *work*; and in times like the present, the defence of the faith by every available means left us by the law, is the primary object to be put before us. In times of war, many of the blessings of peace must be sacrificed. We will give Mr. Monro one hint with reference to his proposal to leave all our Church affairs to certain lawyers. The difference between lawyers and clergy is, that the former *talk* on Church questions, while the latter *act* in them. Mr. Monro will live, we hope, to see his mistake. "The Judicial Committee of Privy Council and the Petition for a Church Tribunal," by an Anglican Layman, (Pickering,) is by one of those opinionated persons who will not take any part in a general movement, if it does not go exactly to the length they think advisable. He thinks the supremacy ought to be abolished, and therefore he will not ask for any lesser liberty for the Church. Men like these are perfectly impracticable, and are always in the way, with their pertinacious folly.

As long as bishoprics and deaneries are dispensed in reward of labours in defence of the Government system of education in England and Ireland, we shall have occasional pamphlets like that of Mr. Girdlestone, "The Committee of Council on Education; an Imaginary Enemy a Real Friend." (Hatchards.) The Government's possession of patronage will always raise up friends for it amongst the clergy. The Rev. E. W. Grinfield's very curious and learned work, "An Apology for the Septuagint," (Pickering,) which maintains the inspiration of that translation, is very well deserving of attention, as well as his "Letter to Dr. Wiseman" on an "interpolated" passage in the Vatican Septuagint. (Pickering.) The interpolation referred to is a curious one. We are glad to see a publication by Chancellor Harington, on "The Reconsecration, Reconciliation, &c. of Churches" (Rivingtons): it abounds in learning and original documents. Archdeacon Hale's "Duties of Deacons and Priests compared," (Rivingtons,) contains most excellent suggestions for the revival of the diaconate; but we shall never be able to have such plans carried into effect till we get our synods. We shall then have a Legislature that looks to the spiritual welfare of the Church in the first place, instead of thrusting it aside amongst the lumber and rubbish which burden temporal legislation.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

AUSTRIA.—Emancipation of the Romish Church.—An Imperial decree, of the 18th of April last, annuls the restrictions imposed upon the Romish Bishops by the laws which have been in force in the Austrian Empire ever since the reign of Joseph II. such as regards their communication with the Pope, and their intercourse with their own dioceses; with the only proviso, that, if documents intended for publication, copies shall be furnished to the civil authorities. The internal discipline of the Church is left entirely to the spiritual power, without any interference on the part of the State, which is bound to assist in carrying into effect sentences of the spiritual courts as proof of the regularity of the proceedings. The Emperor still reserves to himself the nomination to vacant bishoprics, but promises to be guided by the advice of the bishops, especially if those of the province in which the vacancy occurs. The regulations of the Synods recently held at Olmütz and Salzburg, with regard to the exercise of ecclesiastical patronage, are confirmed by the Emperor. Other and minor points are left for adjustment hereafter, upon conference with the bishops, or negotiation, if necessary, with the Pope. The tendency of the whole decree is, to restore in its plenitude, and with hardly a limitation upon it, the power of the Romish hierarchy in the Austrian dominions.

BELGIUM.—Legal Status of Romish Priests.—The question whether the civil law should recognise the indelibility of the orders, and, by consequence, the irrevocable obligation of the vows of celibacy, of the Romish priesthood, has recently been brought before the legal tribunals of Belgium, under the following circumstances. M. Poulet, priest at Florée, suddenly renounced celibacy, and solicited the hand of a young girl. The father having refused his consent, his opposition brought the case before the tribunal of Ghent, whose decision rejects as unfounded this opposition; the priest not having taken the engagement of celibacy towards the State, but solely towards his spiritual Head, and being entitled, on renouncing the advantages and immunities of his ministry, to all the privileges of a Belgian and a citizen. In France, the Court of Cassation has pronounced three judgments of a contrary nature.

CANADA.—Toronto Diocese. The University Question.—The sensation produced in the Diocese of Toronto by the recent secularisation of the University, is deep and general; and the suggestion of the Bishop for the establishment of a Church University, is meeting with the most active and liberal support. A General Board has been formed in Toronto City, for the purpose of promoting this important object, and has placed itself in immediate communication with the local

Committees throughout the Diocese. An instalment of twenty per cent. on all sums subscribed for the New University, has been declared due on the 1st of September, and measures have been taken for the conveyance of gifts of land to Trustees, who are to transfer such lands to the University upon its obtaining a Charter. The subscriptions announced up to the 11th of April last, amounted already to 23,363*l.*, in money, land, and stock, besides 2840 acres and two town lots of land not valued. The *Church Newspaper*, too, is doing excellent service by republishing a series of documents connected with the history of the old University.

On the Bishop taking his departure for Europe, on the morning of the 10th of April, he was met on the wharf by a large concourse of the *élite* of Toronto, who remained to bid him farewell. Addresses from the different congregations of the city had previously been presented to his lordship. The following forms of prayer, ordered to be used throughout the Diocese, during the absence of the Bishop, will be read with interest.

Immediately on his lordship's departure it was ordered, that at Morning Prayer, when the Litany is used, after the words, "That it may please Thee to preserve all that travel by land or by water," should be added, "especially Thy servant, the Bishop of this Diocese." And at Evening Service, after the Prayer "For all conditions of men," the following Prayer was directed to be used:—"O eternal Lord, who alone spreadest out the heavens, and rulest the raging of the sea; who hast compassed the waters with bounds until day and night come to an end; Be pleased to receive into Thy almighty and most gracious protection the Bishop of this Diocese, that he may be preserved from the dangers of the sea, and may return in safety to enjoy the blessings of the land, and the fruits of his labours, and with a thankful remembrance of Thy mercies, to praise and glorify Thy holy name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

On the intelligence of the Bishop's safe arrival in England being received, the following prayer was substituted, to be used at Morning Service before the "General Thanksgiving," and at Evening Service, before the Prayer "For all conditions of men:—"O Lord God, who by the guidance of a star didst direct the wise men to the birth-place of Thy blessed Son; Prosper, we beseech Thee, Thy servant the Bishop of this Diocese in the work which he has undertaken; protect him by Thy Providence; and grant that, in Thy good time, he may return amongst us in health and safety, with the fruit of his labours, to Thine honour and glory, and to the benefit of this Church and people, through the merits of the same Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

We readily give insertion to the following appeal, addressed by the Bishop to the Churchmen in this country, in furtherance of the object which, at his advanced period of life, has induced his lordship to cross the Atlantic:—

"Beloved Brethren,—Under the pressure of what I feel to be a very great necessity, I have ceased for a short time from my pastoral labours

in the Diocese of Toronto, and have come to England to appeal. I have not in vain, to the sympathy of the members of the Church of England in behalf of their brethren in Upper Canada.

“When, in the year 1799, I made that distant portion of the British empire my home, it contained not more than 20,000 inhabitants. Even in 1824, the population had only risen to 150,000; but since that period the increase has been astonishing, being now (1850) 500,000, or more than fivefold in twenty-six years, and according to its present rapid rate of increase, so much accelerated by steam navigation, and by the circumstances which compel emigration from Great Britain and Ireland, there is no doubt that many who are now living will see its population far greater than that of Scotland.

“Of its present inhabitants I may venture to say, that 200,000, at least, are members of the Church of England, and the greater part of them either emigrants from the United Kingdom, or the children of such emigrants. Hence the Diocese of Toronto promises to be the principal seat of our Church in British North America.

“The present policy of the mother country, whether it be wise or unwise, is to confer upon her great colonial possessions almost uncontrolled powers of government, so that their subordination to Imperial authority is in fact rather nominal than real. Being left to model their civil institutions as they please, their moral condition and social happiness are dependent on the chance of their forming a right judgment of their best interests. And this, where suffrage is almost universal, as it is in Upper Canada, leaves all dependent on the virtue and intelligence of the people.

“For the education of the great mass of the people in common schools, liberal provision has been made by the Legislature, under a system which is conducted with ability and zeal, but which, nevertheless, labours under the vital defect of excluding all doctrinal instruction in religion, or, in other words, all practical teaching of religious truth.

“To secure an adequate provision for education of that higher order which is necessary to prepare youth for the liberal professions and for the important duties of legislation, had been, for fifty years, the self-imposed labour of my life.

“In 1827, before which time the Province was scarcely qualified to receive it, we had the happiness to see in Upper Canada a University founded by Royal Charter, and liberally endowed by the Crown with a grant of land. So little exclusive was it in its character, that its advantages were open to all; no tests were required from professors or students, with the exception of the professor of divinity and of graduates in that faculty.

“But it was avowedly a College in connexion with the National Church, and provision was made in the Charter for insuring unity and consistency in its discipline and government.

“If it had been otherwise, the Charter would have been such as had never before issued under the Great Seal of England for the foundation of a University to be endowed by the Crown in any part of the British

dominions. Yet, because it was complained of as unreasonable and unjust that a University should be founded by the sovereign in connexion with the Established Church of the empire, it was thought expedient to allow the Royal Charter to be so altered by a Colonial statute, as to leave no trace in it of a connexion with the National Church.

“ This change was made in 1837 ; and, as was foreseen by many, it half accomplished the ruin of the University. For though neither religious instruction nor Divine worship was excluded, and though in deference to the express wish of the Sovereign, King William IV., a Professorship of Divinity according to the doctrines of the Church of England, and the daily use of her admirable Liturgy, were tolerated for a time, during which the University was flourishing, and rapidly rising in public estimation and confidence, yet the Colonial legislature, having been once allowed to mutilate the Royal Charter, has not stopped short in the work of destruction.

“ In the last session an Act was passed, which came into force on the first day of January, 1850, expressly excluding from the College religious instruction according to any form of doctrine whatever ; prohibiting any form of prayer, or any act of public worship, and disqualifying any Graduate of the University, who may have taken holy orders, from having a voice in the Senate.

“ By this measure, which I think I do not too harshly describe when I speak of it as impious, the munificent gift of His Majesty King George IV., (a gift the present value of which is estimated at 270,000*l.*, and yields a revenue, that is yearly increasing, of about 11,000*l.*), is at last worse than thrown away ; for, deprived of the respect and confidence of the sound and intelligent portion of the community, to whatever denomination of Christians they may belong, the University cannot flourish ; or if by any exertion it can be sustained for a time, it must be at the sacrifice of the highest and most sacred interests.

“ A deep conviction of this forces itself upon the mind of every religious man ; but the members of the Church of England, utterly despairing of, and rejecting as they do what was once King's College, but is now the antichristian “ University of Toronto,” do yet not despair of their Church, or of their cause. Relying on the blessings of God, and using their own best exertions, they hope soon to succeed in establishing a University strictly and unreservedly in connexion with their Church ; a University not confining itself to instruction in human science, but a University of which the religious character shall be known and acknowledged, in which the doctrines of the Church of England shall be taught in their integrity, and in which her pure and ‘ reasonable service ’ shall elevate and sanctify the labours of the teacher and the scholar.

“ We hope to succeed in establishing for ourselves, without pecuniary aid from any public source, a University clearly and avowedly in connexion with our Church, receiving only from our gracious Sovereign what other religious denominations in the province have received, a

Charter of Incorporation, providing for the government of the Institution, and conferring on it the privilege of conferring Degrees.

“ I am labouring, at an advanced age, to lay the foundation of a work which I believe will, at no distant day, be of inestimable value to that rising country.—The efforts which I made in the province, just before my departure, have been nobly seconded. Within a few weeks, the contributions in money and land amounted to more than twenty-five thousand pounds. Yet this effort, astonishing as it is, considering the state of the contributors, struggling for subsistence in the wilderness, far from the land of their fathers, is scarcely sufficient to erect the necessary buildings. But does it not constitute a claim all but irresistible upon the members of the Church in this country, to supply the deficiency as to endowment? Hence, having done our utmost, my people as well as myself feel ourselves justified in relying with filial confidence upon the enlightened patriotism, the religious zeal, the generous sympathy of our brethren at home, for enabling us to establish, in this populous and important Colony, upon a sound foundation and on a liberal scale, a seat of learning with which political agitation shall have no pretence to meddle, and which will assuredly prove an invaluable blessing to the country, and to many thousands in it who were inhabitants of the United Kingdom; and not a blessing to those only who belong to the Church of England, but to all who may desire to avail themselves of the means of education which such an Institution will offer.

“ I trust God will put it into the hearts of those of our fellow-churchmen in this country to whom He has entrusted wealth, to give us liberally of their abundance; and that those who can only by the exercise of a prudent economy have any thing to spare, may still spare us a little; for what we have undertaken can only be accomplished on an adequate scale, by the co-operation of many.

“ It is not long since an English gentleman, Mr. Smithson, bequeathed a princely sum of money for the promotion of science by means of an institution to be founded in the capital of the United States of America, to which country I am not aware that he was bound by any particular tie. If, happily, some other English gentleman, of equal means and equal philanthropy, should so far combine patriotism with benevolence as to make Upper Canada the recipient of so large a bounty, he would be laying the foundation of infinite good to a country rapidly rising into importance, and would be doing more than it seems can be done, in present times, by legislatures and governments for the best interests of the people.

“ I am, beloved brethren,

“ Your faithful and affectionate brother,

“ J. TORONTO.”

“ 19, Bury-Street, St. James's, May 4, 1850.”

Repudiation of the University by the Presbyterians.—The Commission of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church at Kingston have resolved to

carry on their own institution of Queen's College in conformity with its royal Charter, irrespectively of the University Act passed last session of the Provincial Parliament. Among the reasons assigned for this determination, the first is as follows:—

“The irreligious character of the Act referred to. Not only is the teaching of Theology prohibited in the University of Toronto, but all forms of Divine Worship, all public prayer, every thing that can remind either professors or students of God, and the duties we owe to Him,—of our responsibilities and obligations, is rigidly and peremptorily excluded. And as no test whatever is required of the professors, not even belief in the existence of God, there is nothing in the Act to prevent infidels, atheists, or persons holding the most dangerous and pernicious principles, from being entrusted with the instruction of youth at that time of life when evil impressions are most likely to be made upon their minds.”

Building Society in connexion with the Church.—A Building Society in connexion with the Church has been formed in Upper Canada, with the approbation of the Bishop, who has recommended it to the clergy and laity of his diocese in a Pastoral Letter, in which his Lordship explains the manner in which such a Society may be useful to the Church, as well as to the projected Church University:—

“Persons of small means, who are anxious to do something for the Church, or University, frequently find it inconvenient to advance at once what they desire to give. Now, to such, the Building Society offers the advantage of profitable investment by receiving such donations in small payments, monthly, quarterly, or half-yearly. This process may be beneficially applied to building Churches, Parsonages—Parochial Endowments—as well as to the University.

“I think it right to submit these suggestions to the members of the Church, lay and clerical, as meeting in the most easy way such efforts as our poor and scattered population are able to make, and which, if prudently carried out, seem to promise great advantage to the progress and stability of the Church. For details, I would respectfully refer to Thomas Champion, Esq., who is familiar with the working of Building Societies, and will give with pleasure ample information on the subject to any who require it.

“By following some such plan, we may soon have a fertile glebe, a parsonage-house, and a University lot, in every township.”

Church Statistics.—The following tabular statement of the result of the Bishop's Visitations in the Diocese of Toronto at the periods named, presents, except as to the number of Clergy, a satisfactory view of the progress of the Church:—

	1840.	1842-3.	1845-6.	1848-9.
Parishes	96	102	197	210
Clergy	71	103	118	131
Persons Confirmed..	1791	3699	4358	5213

Colonial Church Emancipation.—A Bill is about to be, and probably by this time has been, introduced into the Legislature of Canada, by

the Hon. P. De Laquerrière in the better government of the Church in Upper Canada. The Bill proposes to divide the present Diocese of Toronto into three, viz. York, Kingston, and London: the Bishops to be elected by a Convocation of Clergy and Laity of the province, and the election to be subject to the Queen's approbation. The alterations in the constitution of the Church contemplated by M. De Laquerrière, are mainly borrowed from the regulations of the American Church.

Quebec Diocese.—The Bishop of Montreal has been engaged in February and March last in a Visitation tour through a portion of his Diocese, in the course of which he inspected Bishop's College, at Lennoxville, where he held an Ordination on the second Sunday in Lent, and admitted five Candidates to Deacons' Orders, and one Deacon to Priests' Orders. The number of Students still remaining at the College, in training for the Ministry, is twelve. He also held four Confirmations, at which 171 persons received that holy rite.

CAPE.—Mission to Kaffraria.—The Bishop of Cape Town has determined to make an attempt to christianise the Kaffers, and with this view proposes the establishment of a Mission in British Kaffraria. The following is the plan on which the Bishop proposes to proceed:—"To endeavour to engage in the first instance, as a commencement of the work, the services of a Priest and Deacon, who shall proceed at once to the field of their future labour, and commence the work with the aid of a Kaffer interpreter, already provided. We do not contemplate going to any great expense in the erection of a Mission station and premises. We hope that the Clergy who may feel disposed to offer themselves for this work, will be prepared to lead a simple, self-denying life; engaging to some extent in manual labour, and willing to live with but few more comforts about them than those possessed by the people to whom they will be sent. We do not propose, therefore, to offer any stipend, but only to undertake to provide for the actual wants of our brethren."

FRANCE.—The Educational Question.—The new law of education, of which we gave an abstract in our last number¹, has given rise to so much difference of opinion among the French Bishops, as to the course which it was incumbent on them to pursue, that the Pope has been induced to interpose his authority, by means of a letter of instructions, addressed to them by the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris. The principal points of difficulty are, the right of inspection over the *petits séminaires* claimed by the State, the association of the Bishops with Protestant Ministers and Jewish Rabbis in the "Superior Council of Public Instruction," and the establishment of mixed schools by the State. The Pope, having taken the advice of a special congregation of Cardinals, convened for the occasion, points out to the Bishops the necessity of occasional compromise, in order to avoid more serious injuries to the cause of religion, and with a view to the maintenance and restoration of the

¹ See this volume, pp. 237—241.

"Catholic faith," as well as the importance of united action on the part of the Church. Acting upon this principle he gives his sanction to such of the Bishops as may be elected, taking their seats at the board of the "Superior Council of Public Instruction," in the hope that, "by their zeal and authority, by their doctrine and prudence, they will be enabled, under all circumstances, boldly to defend the law of God, and of the Church." In case, however, that adverse decisions should prevail in the Council, they are advised to make the matter the subject of communication to their flocks, so as to enlighten the public mind on the state of the question. The State Inspection over the *petits séminaires* is passed over in silence; but, in reference to the establishment of mixed schools, the Pope urgently recommends, that, whenever in any diocese mixed schools shall be established, the Bishops should use the most unwearied efforts to procure for the "Catholic" children the benefit of a separate school. "For," says the writer, "the Holy Father, bitterly lamenting the progress which *religious indifferentism* has made in France, as well as in other countries, and the frightful effects which it has produced in corrupting the faith of the people, is most anxiously desirous, that, on this important point, the pastors should never cease, as occasion may serve, to lift up their voices, and carefully to instruct the faithful committed to their charge, on the necessity of having but one faith, and one religion,—truth itself being one; and often to call to their remembrance, and to explain to them, the fundamental dogma, that "out of the Catholic Church there is no salvation."

ITALY.—*Return of the Pope to Rome.*—Pius IX. has at length returned to Rome. After much hesitation and repeated delays, he at last made up his mind to the journey, and arrived in his capital, in perfect safety, under the protection of French bayonets and the roll of French drums, on the 12th of April, after an exile of seventeen months. The measures of the police were so efficiently taken, that, with the exception of a small infernal machine, the explosion of which broke a few windows, and of several fruitless attempts to fire the city, in the quarter of the Quirinal, no symptoms of disorder appeared. Whatever could be done by state ceremonial and military pomp to give a striking character to the event, was done; but the popular enthusiasm which had ushered in the reign of Pius IX., was visibly wanting on his restoration.

The course of the Papal Government since his return has been characterized by a manifest tendency to fall back as much as possible into the system which prevailed before the accession of the present Pontiff; and while the occupation of the French arms continues, the population has no choice but to submit in silence.

On the 20th of May the Pope held a secret consistory, and delivered himself of an Allocution, which is the only official document of any importance connected with his restoration. After describing the late revolution as the work of the "Prince of darkness, who seemed to vomit forth all his rage against the Church, and against the Apostolic

See, and to disport himself in that very city, the centre of Catholic truth," the Allocution expresses gratitude to Heaven for having put an end to that state of things, and brought the Pope back to Rome. It then proceeds to mention in terms of eulogy and of grateful acknowledgment, the services rendered to the Pope by the King of the Two Sicilies, by the French Republic and its illustrious President, by the Emperor of Austria, and by the Queen of Spain, and even by Princes who are not in communion with the Roman See. The diplomatic body and the college of Cardinals come in next for a complimentary notice; after which, the first part of the Allocution winds up with another thanksgiving to the God of mercy, and to "the most Holy Mother of God, the Immaculate Virgin Mary, to whose most powerful patronage we refer the deliverance which we have received."

The Allocution next glances at the present state of Christendom, and at the "terrible and internecine war carried on between light and darkness, between truth and error, between vice and virtue, between Belial and Christ," and exhorts the Bishops to do all that lies in their power to stir up their flocks, and especially their clergy, to strenuous exertions for the restoration of the truth, and of general religion. The document then adverts, with great satisfaction, to the concessions made to the Romish Church in Austria; and, in the very opposite tone, that of severe censure to the recent proceedings of the Sardinian government. The conduct of the Belgian government on the Education question, is alluded to as a ground of uneasiness; and the whole winds up with pious wishes for the prosperity of the Church, that is, of Rome.

The Sardinian Government and the Papacy.—A dispute has arisen between the Sardinian Government and Legislature and the Romish Hierarchy in the Sardinian States, supported by the Pope himself, which is likely to lead to a complete rupture between them, and which is highly instructive, as it shows that the claims of the Papacy to a supreme jurisdiction over the subjects of independent States, supposed by a certain school of politicians to have been long extinct, are to this day maintained in their fullest extent, and, when occasion serves, with the utmost vigour.

Early in the present year a project of law was introduced into the Sardinian Chamber to abolish the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical tribunals in civil matters, to abrogate the immunities of the Clergy, to do away with the right of asylum in Churches and Monasteries, and to diminish, and regulate for the future, the number of Church festivals, on the ground of their interfering with the ordinary business of life. To this law, which, from having been adopted by the Minister, Count Siccardi, goes by the name of the Law Siccardi, the strongest opposition was offered by the Papal party in the Chamber, and by the Romish hierarchy; but the Chamber and the Government took no notice of this opposition, but proceeded with the measure.

During the early stages of its discussion, protests against the project were presented by the Bishops of the different provinces. The law was declared,—as, for instance, in the protest of the Bishops of Savoy,

which is lying before us,—to be contrary to the fundamental Statute of the kingdom, which recognises the “Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion” as the only religion of the State. By this Article, the Bishops contend, “the Government of Sardinia stands pledged before the face of Europe and of the whole world, to acknowledge the Sovereign Pontiff as Head of the Church, and as Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth,” and to treat questions arising from time to time between the Church and the State “with suitable regard and deference.” To abrogate the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil matters, without obtaining the Pope’s permission to do so, is in this view a breach of the respect due to the Papacy, and absolutely unlawful. Mutual consent is necessary by the law of nations, for altering matters regulated by solemn treaties between different Governments; and surely, say the Bishops, the “august Sovereign of 200,000,000 of Catholic subjects, has a right to be treated at least on the same footing as the temporal Sovereigns of Europe.” Sardinia, which has for ages admitted the jurisdiction now proposed to be abrogated, and which for more than a century has been bound in these matters by special Concordats,—the last of which was concluded in 1841 between Gregory XVI. and Charles Albert—is therefore incompetent to deal with this question by the act of its Government or its Legislature; to do so without the consent of the Sovereign Pontiff, is “a formal act of contempt, an open rupture, an incipient Schism.” If this jurisdiction involves a concession on the part of the temporal power, concessions have also been made by the Papacy, *e.g.* the right of nomination to the Episcopate, which may be taken away again; and this particular concession it might be at this time expedient to revoke, and so to remove the selection of Bishops from the influence of political consideration.

As regards the reduction of the number of festivals, the Bishops declare that they do not object to the principle, but they think the law carries it too far; and above all, they complain of any thing being determined in this matter without a previous understanding with the Church. But especially they urge, that if the State by its law shall permit work to be done on certain days (which is all the law proposes to do), while the Church in the name of the Pope prohibits such work under pain of mortal sin, “the performance of work authorized by the law, and protected by the police, will be virtually a public profession of Protestantism.”

The Bishops of Piedmont in their protest declare that to make the proposed changes without the intervention of the Sovereign Pontiff, is to overturn the divine constitution of the Church, to attack the rights of the Holy See, to violate all the Concordats, to trouble the consciences, and to wound and afflict all who desire to live and die in the obedience of the Catholic Church. They warn the king (to whom one of their protests is addressed) of the probable consequences, if Pius IX. should be forced to have recourse to an exercise of his Apostolic powers for the protection of his rights; they remind him that the laws of the Church threaten with excommunication all who shall

violate the ecclesiastical immunities, or do violence to the ministers of the Sanctuary.

On the festival question, they observe that the right to enjoin the observance of particular days is undoubtedly inherent in the ecclesiastical authority; and that the attempt made by the minister of a temporal Sovereign to reduce the number of festivals, is a violation of the most essential rights of the spiritual power.

These protests of the Episcopate were backed by a diplomatic note from Cardinal Antonelli, in which he expresses the Pope's determination to uphold the afflicted Church of Piedmont, and the rights of the Holy See; and not only objects to the project of law itself, but complains of the insinuation, (contained in a communication on the subject, addressed to the Cardinal by the Sardinian Ambassador at Portici), that "the Holy See had refused to treat with the Sardinian Government." The Cardinal represents it as a great act of condescension, on the part of the Pope, that when, in 1848, the Count Siccardi was sent to him for the purpose of negotiating a fresh Concordat, he consented to entertain the proposal, instead of simply insisting, as he might have done, upon the observance of the existing Concordats; adding, that if the negotiations had no practical result, this must be attributed to the force of events, in consequence of which Count Siccardi was recalled. Besides, he contends, that on the particular points contemplated by the project of law, the Count never made any communication whatever to the Holy See during his stay; and that the communication, since received, transmitting the project of law, cannot be considered as an invitation to treat, as it was accompanied by a declaration that the mind of the Sardinian Government was made up upon the subject. Under these circumstances, while praying that Piedmont may be preserved from "the chastisements sent upon all other nations who thought to promote their prosperity by humbling the Clergy, and depressing the authority of Holy Church," the Pope, mindful of his duty, "protests loudly before God and man against the wounds about to be inflicted on the authority of the Church, against any innovation contrary to his rights, and those of the Holy See, and against any infringement of existing treaties, on the observance of which he insists."

In spite of all these protests, Episcopal and Papal, the Sardinian Legislature pursued its course, and while abandoning the question of the number of festivals, enacted a law on ecclesiastical jurisdiction and immunities, which was promulgated on the 9th of April, having received the Royal Assent, and of which the principal provisions are as follow:

Art. 1. Declares all civil causes whatsoever, whether between ecclesiastics and laymen, or between ecclesiastics only, to be cognizable by the civil tribunals.

Art. 2. Claims for the civil tribunals jurisdiction over all causes touching the right of nomination to ecclesiastical benefices, or the property belonging to those benefices, or to other ecclesiastical institutions.

Art. 3. Subjects the persons of ecclesiastics to the penal laws of the State.

Art. 4. Prohibits the infliction by ecclesiastical tribunals, of the penalties decreed by the laws of the State, restricting their power to the infliction of spiritual penalties.

Art. 5. Declares the general rules of competency to be applicable to the state of the law as altered by the four preceding Articles.

Art. 6. Provides that warrants for personal arrests, or search-warrants and executions, shall be carried into effect in churches and other places hitherto regarded as places of refuge; taking care, however, not to cause any disturbance of public worship, and giving notice thereof immediately after to the proper ecclesiastical authority.

Art. 7. Charges the King's government with the preparation of a project of law for regulating the marriage contract in its civil character.

Immediately after the promulgation of this law, the Papal Nuncio took his departure, and the Archbishop of Turin issued the following Circular to his Clergy:—

“Turin, April 18, 1850.

“Sir and Brother,—As the civil law cannot absolve the Clergy from the spiritual obligations imposed upon them by the laws of the Church, and by the Concordats which regulate their application, I charge you to intimate to the ecclesiastics of your parish,—

“1. That if they are summoned as witnesses before a lay-judge, they must apply as heretofore to the archiepiscopal authority, for the purpose of obtaining the necessary authorization.

“2. That if they are cited before a lay-tribunal for causes which, according to the Concordats, are cognizable only by the episcopal courts, they must seek for proper directions from their Ordinary.

“3. That if the lay-tribunal should take criminal proceedings against them, in other cases than those mentioned by the Convention of the 27th of March, 1841, they must likewise apply to the Ordinary; and if, for want of time, or the necessary means, they cannot do this, or if they apprehend that their refusal to reply to the interrogatories may be attended by some great inconvenience, they must plead the incompetency of the tribunal, and protest that they intend no prejudice to the right of personal immunity, but are only yielding to necessity. After which their making answer will not be imputed to them as a fault.

“4. The curate or rector of a Church must enter a similar protest as often as any act shall be committed, in contravention of local immunity.

“5. If an ecclesiastical person or establishment has cause of action against any other ecclesiastical person or establishment, the Ordinary must be applied to for instructions as to the course of proceeding.

“6. These directions must be considered as provisional, until the Holy See shall have transmitted the further instructions which have been applied for.

“I have no manner of doubt that, comprehending the importance of

this subject, you will display your utmost zeal in an exact compliance with these directions, and think it, therefore, unnecessary to add special recommendations. I shall only add that, if any one should fail to observe them, I desire that I may be immediately informed of the fact.

"As the happy return of the Pope into his States must cause among all Catholics, and especially among the Clergy, the most sincere joy, and the most profound thankfulness to Divine Providence, the prayers *pro gratiarum actione et pro Papa*, will have to be added, provided the rite admits of it, both at mass, and at the benediction of the Holy Sacrament, during eight days from the receipt of these presents.

"I am, with sentiments of the most perfect esteem, your most affectionate brother,

"Luigi, Archbishop."

The appearance of this circular greatly exasperated the Government, which immediately caused every copy of it to be seized at the printer's, and even in the Archbishop's own palace. The Journal *L'Armonia*, which had given insertion to the document, with a few words of favourable comment, was likewise seized, both at the office of the Journal, and at the Post-office. The Archbishop himself was cited to appear before the *juge d'instruction*, with a view to legal proceedings against him. To this citation the Archbishop replied, that however willing he might be to act himself upon the rules laid down by him for the guidance of his clergy, it was impossible for him to do so, because, in criminal causes, the Bishops are exclusively subject to the Sovereign Pontiff, and any appearance of an Archbishop or Bishop before any lay authority, even in the character of a witness, without an express authorization from the Pope, is absolutely prohibited. He therefore prayed for time to enable him to procure such authorization, after which he expressed himself willing to comply with the requirements of the law. This demand involving the very principle at issue was, of course, refused; and the Archbishop signified his determination to obey "God rather than men," and to abide the consequences. The result was that, on the 4th of May the Archbishop was arrested, and imprisoned in the citadel; but with little effect, so far as the progress of the suit against him was concerned, as he still persisted in his refusal to answer any questions. Before however proceeding to this extremity, the Minister of the Interior wrote to the Archbishop to apprise him of his intention, at the same time making him responsible for whatever disorder might ensue, and suggesting the propriety of his avoiding arrest by quitting the town; but the Archbishop repudiated the responsibility, and declared his intention to remain. No sooner had the intelligence of the arrest of the Archbishop reached the provinces, than adhesions of bishops and clergy to the course taken by him poured in from all sides, and the Government were obliged, for the sake of their own consistency, to deal a similar measure to the Archbishop of Sassari, who was likewise arrested on the ground of his

disobedience to the new law ; in fact, to have been perfectly consistent, the Government ought to have imprisoned the Episcopate of the entire kingdom. On the 23rd of May, the trial of the Archbishop of Turin came on. The principle for which he contended throughout prevented him from pleading before the Court, and as he intimated his resolution not to answer any questions put to him, if dragged into Court by force, his presence was dispensed with, the Court appointing counsel to defend him in his absence. The counsel for the prosecution pleaded simply disobedience to the civil law ; the counsel for the defence pleaded the recognition of the ecclesiastical law by the State, and the legal validity of the Concordats, and contended that in a conflict between the ecclesiastical law and the new enactment of the civil legislature, the Archbishop had done no more than his duty, in issuing directions for the guidance of the Clergy under his jurisdiction ; and that he was the less obnoxious to the civil law, because, so far from enjoining disobedience to it, he had in fact directed compliance with it, under protest, which was a legitimate course of action, and the only one possible under the circumstances, without a violation of the ecclesiastical law. The jury, however, found a verdict for the Crown, and the Archbishop was sentenced to one month imprisonment, to commence from the date of his arrest, and to a fine of 500 francs ; a sentence which only provoked a fresh manifestation of feeling on the part of the united episcopate, in addresses of sympathy which declare that the course pursued by the Archbishop was the only course open to him in the conscientious discharge of his duty.

Meanwhile, the Pope himself was not a silent spectator of these transactions. Though the Papal Nuncio had been recalled from the court of Turin, the Sardinian Government had still an envoy at Rome, and to him Cardinal Antonelli addressed, on the 14th of May, a note, in which, on the part of the Pope, he protests, as formerly against the new enactment, so now against the imprisonment of the Archbishop, and demands his instant liberation, by way of reparation. Whether this note had reached the Sardinian Government before the trial of the Archbishop, does not appear ; at all events, in the temper in which that Government is at present, it was not likely to be affected by it, being determined, it seems, to risk a rupture with the Papacy, rather than acknowledge the claims of supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which to maintain in its integrity, is the object of the passive resistance of the Archbishop, and of the protests of his colleagues in the episcopate.

The following extract from the note of Cardinal Antonelli, embodies the principles upon which this claim of the Papacy is founded :

“ Whatever reforms it may be thought desirable to introduce into the civil administration of the Sardinian states, the venerable laws of the Church will ever be superior to them, and entitled to be respected in a Catholic kingdom. And whatever right those states may have to constitute themselves under new forms of civil administration, that right can in no wise diminish the validity of the canonical sanctions,

and of the solemn stipulations previously existing between the Holy See and Piedmont, sanctions and stipulations which bear in a great measure upon the very matters to which these legislative reforms are directed. The Government of the Holy See, strictly observant of these treaties, had a right to expect that the other contracting party, having entered into a formal engagement to do so, would likewise respect them. Such reciprocity was the more to be expected, as the aforesaid Convention was guaranteed by an express reservation in the fundamental statute of the kingdom.

“ Having regard to the laws of the Church to which I have referred, and to the existing special treaties, your lordship and your royal government will, in their wisdom, have no difficulty to comprehend the gravity of the outrage committed by the civil tribunal against the person of the illustrious Archbishop.

“ It is distressing to have to add, that the injurious treatment to which the prelate in question has been subjected, has resulted from no other cause than the care with which he has prescribed to his clergy for the guidance of their consciences, the rules which they were to follow amidst the innovations made in the civil laws of the state, innovations which violate the rights of the ecclesiastical authority, and which have been put in force, notwithstanding the just protests of the Supreme Head of the Church, whose directions the holy pastors, commissioned by the Holy Ghost to assist him in the universal government of the mystical vine of our Divine Lord, are bound to follow without the least deviation.”

Whatever may be the termination of this affair, and whatever the intrinsic unsoundness of the Papal theory, it is clear that according to that theory the Archbishop of Turin is perfectly justified in the course which he has taken, and is to be regarded in the light of a martyr; while, on the contrary, the conduct pursued by the Sardinian government is palpably inconsistent with the profession of the Romish faith, and with the relations in which it has hitherto stood to the Papacy.

Another Lying Wonder.—Among the means resorted to by the Romish Church for the recovery of her waning influence, is the revival of the lying wonders of the worst periods of mediæval superstition. At the present moment the Popish prints are full of wondrous tales of a picture of the Virgin at Rimini, which is reported to move its eyes in a miraculous manner. We borrow from the *John Bull* the following account of the alleged miracle, abridged from the letter of a correspondent of the *Ami de la Religion*:—“ On Saturday, the 11th of May, it was observed that a picture of the Virgin Mary, which is worshipped in the small Church of Santa Clara, at Rimini, under the title ‘ Mother of Mercy,’ and which is painted on canvas, framed and glazed, had moved its eyes. On the following day, being Sunday, the miracle was again observed, when a great crowd collected in the Chapel of the Madonna, and the most violent excitement of devotion ensued in the spectators. To convince the unbelievers, the picture was taken out of the frame, the glass removed, and the bare canvas exposed, and still,

the picture went on moving its eyes, and continued to do so several times on its way from Santa Clara to the great Church of St. Augustine, to which it was carried in procession. A number of miraculous cures were effected; among them, blind persons received their sight. The Bishop of Rimini proceeded to examine into the case, and certified the miracle, which is attested by other Bishops and Dignitaries of the Romish Church, and, moreover, by the Commandant of the Austrian garrison, who, and with him two officers, came in a scoffing mood, but—such was the effect of the miracle upon them—left their decorations with the Virgin as votive offerings." A subsequent account states that the Bishop of Cesena, after sending two of his Canons, and not being satisfied with their report, came himself, and after having been prostrated in prayer before the image for a few instants, he saw "the eyes of the miraculous Madonna opening, and fixed upon himself, and during five minutes he was enabled to contemplate the seven wonders of paradise, till he was obliged to turn away his eyes, being unable to endure the brilliancy of what he saw."

New Canonizations.—The Pope has added two new saints to the Calendar; Peter Claver, a Jesuit, who died nearly 200 years ago, and Germana Cousin, a shepherd girl, born in the neighbourhood of Toulouse in 1579.

The General of the Jesuits.—Father Roothan, the General of the Jesuits, has rejoined Pius IX. at Rome.

MADEIRA.—*Episcopal Countenance of Schism.*—It is with sincere regret that we place on record one of those unhappy facts which tend so greatly to the injury of our beloved Church by exposing the want of union and consistency within her pale. Our readers no doubt remember that there are in the island of Madeira two chaplains, and two congregations, both professedly belonging to the Church of England, but in direct opposition to each other: one of the Chaplains, the Rev. Mr. Lowe, officiating under the licence of his ecclesiastical superior, the Lord Bishop of London; the other, the Rev. Mr. Browne, under favour of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Such being the relative position of the two clergymen and of their congregations, we grieve to say, that the Bishop of Bombay, while a temporary resident in the island, has thought fit to attend Divine Service at Mr. Browne's chapel. A strong protest has been signed by several of the clergy resident in the island, against this proceeding on the part of his Lordship, as implying a sanction given by a Bishop of our Church to "the principle that there can be in the Church of England a so-called Episcopal body, not recognised by, or living in communion with, a Bishop."

MALTA.—*Aggressive Proceedings of the Romish Church.*—The spirit by which the Romish Church is animated, has recently been displayed in a most remarkable manner at Malta. In a new code of criminal laws proposed to be introduced in the island, which was framed by the Council of Government, certain articles were inserted intended to make

the Romish Church the *dominant* Church in Malta, and to extend to her superstitions a protection exceeding that given to true religion. The articles in question are to the following effect:—

46. Whosoever shall disturb with violence, or with the design of profanation, the sacred functions or ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion, *dominant in Malta and its dependencies*, during their celebration, whether within the places destined for worship or without, shall be punished with imprisonment from nine months to three years.

If the offence be committed without violence or design of profanation, the punishment shall be imprisonment from one to three months, or fine.

46 (A). Whosoever shall disturb with violence, or with the design of profanation, the functions or ceremonies of any other worship dissentient from that of the dominant Church, shall be punished with imprisonment from six months to two years.

If the offence be committed without violence or design of profanation, the punishment shall be imprisonment from one to three months, or fine.

47. Whosoever shall insult the ministers of the Catholic religion, or those of any other worship dissentient from *the dominant religion*, in their functions, shall be punished with imprisonment from one to three months, or from four to six months.

48. Whosoever shall in public blaspheme or impiously execrate the name of God, or of any of the persons of the most Holy Trinity, or of the Blessed Virgin, or of the Saints, or shall revile or put to ridicule by words, gestures, or exhibition, any article of the Catholic religion, or shall otherwise insult an essential article of the Christian religion as it is received by the generality of Christians, shall be punished with imprisonment from four to six months, or from one to three months, or with fine.

But in slight cases there may be applied any of the penalties established for contraventions.

49. Whosoever shall outrage the objects of worship of the Catholic religion, whether within or without the places destined for worship, shall be punished with imprisonment from one to three months.

When the outrage is a grave one, it shall be in the power of the Court to apply the punishment of imprisonment from four to six months.

The same penalty established in the two preceding paragraphs, shall be applied to whosoever shall outrage the objects of worship of any religious society dissentient from *the dominant religion*, in places destined for worship.

49 (A). Whosoever shall steal from a church of the Catholic religion or the premises adjacent, or any place destined for the worship of any dissentient communion, sacred vessels or sacred furniture, or other objects dedicated to Divine worship, shall be punished, with forced labour, from eighteen months to three years.

When the object stolen shall be the most holy Eucharist, the punish-

ment shall be forced labour from three to five years, and there may be added solitary confinement for not more than six periods.

In consequence of this enactment, the Bishop of Gibraltar has addressed to the Governor of the island the following Protest: *

"We, the undersigned, George, by Divine permission, Bishop of Gibraltar, being by virtue of our office, and by the authority of Her Majesty's letters patent, invested with the power of exercising episcopal jurisdiction according to the ecclesiastical laws of England, in all places belonging to the Church of England within the island of Malta, and being ordinarily resident within the said island, have considered it to be our duty to examine those articles of the proposed code of criminal laws for the said island, which are entitled, "Concerning Offences against the Respect due to Religion," as amended by the Council of Government, and having found that it is therein proposed to make the Church of Rome the dominant Church in Malta; to declare it to be exclusively the Catholic Church; to class the Church of England and other religious bodies of Her Majesty's subjects as dissentients from the Church of Rome as it at present exists in the said island; and to enact heavier penalties for offences against the Roman Catholic worship than for offences against others: therefore we, the Bishop aforesaid, do hereby protest in the strongest manner against the adoption of the said articles, for the following reasons:

"1. Because, whatever may be the privileges granted to the Maltese, the supremacy of the English Crown carries with it of necessity the supremacy of the religion of the Queen and of the people of England, and establishes it by the law of the land in every colony and dependency of the empire, Malta included.

"2. Because this proceeding of the majority of the Council in attempting to make the Church of Rome dominant in Malta, and to declare the religion of the said Church to be exclusively the Catholic religion, is an attack upon the supremacy of the Crown and the fundamental laws of the empire, and an invasion of the rights and privileges of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of England.

"3. Because the attempt to class the Church of England and other bodies of Her Majesty's subjects together as being merely dissenters or dissentient from the Church of Rome as it at present exists in Malta, is an insult to the religion of the Queen and of the people of England.

"4. Because the enactment of greater penalties for offences against the Roman Catholic worship than for offences against the worship of other Christian Churches, is a violation of the principle of equal protection for all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, and of the rights and liberties of Englishmen.

"5. Because neither the clergy nor the people of the Church of England in Malta have given the least occasion for any such proceedings, they having been careful on all occasions to avoid giving offence to their Maltese fellow-subjects in all things connected with their religion.

“ Given at Gibraltar Palace, in the city of Valetta, this twentieth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty.
G. GIBRALTAR.

“ To His Excellency the Honourable Richard More O’Ferrall,
“ Governor of Malta, &c.”

It appears from what passed in the House of Commons, on the intelligence of this proceeding on the part of the Romanists of Malta reaching this country, that the sanction of the Home Government is not likely to be given to the enactment protested against by the Bishop. Meanwhile, the spirit which has given rise to it, reigns supreme in the island, under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Governor, and has vented itself in outrages against the Protestant part of the community, on the occasion of the festivities held at Malta, to celebrate the return of the Pope to Rome. The following is the account of the circumstances given by the *John Bull*, on the authority of the *Malta Mail* :—

“ A grand illumination to celebrate the event of the return of His Holiness Pio IX. to his dominions, took place, very generally, on the night of Saturday last (May the 4th), and partially on Sunday. On Sunday, High Mass was said in all the Churches, and a *Te Deum* sung. His Excellency the Governor and the Consular body, in full uniform, were present, by special invitation, at St. John’s, in the morning, and, in the evening, at the Carmelitan Church. The first thing that engaged our attention before the illumination, was an address to the Maltese, in which this passage occurs :—‘ We, sons of a Father so dear ; SUBJECTS OF A SOVEREIGN SO LIBERAL.’ The circulation of the address was illimited. The next was an innocent attempt to raise the character of the Jesuits, and consisted of a number of small envelopes, containing a piece of cotton. An inscription printed in Italian bore the words of which the following is a translation :—‘ Cotton, in which the bones of S. Francesco de Girolamo, of the Society of Jesus, were enclosed.’ Another circumstance not less striking, is found in the fact of a lot of young people, evidently urged on by designing persons, ‘ running like mad,’ waving flags, and shouting—Long live the Pope—Long live the *dominant* religion—Down with the press, &c. The police very properly stopped the dangerous proceeding, and, we believe, seized the flags. In the transparencies, several were ominously expressive of the feelings of the people, to lower the character of all faiths, in exalting their own.

“ In our Church, at the dockyard, on Sunday morning, the Service was disturbed by the shouts of certain bearers of flags, which were beaten against the window—and in the evening by music. In the morning the aggressors were driven away by Mr. Napier ; but in the evening, the Rev. Mr. Hare was scarce enabled to continue Divine Service. Yesterday (the Ascension), during the performance of Divine Service in the Protestant Church of St. Paul, a stone was thrown through the window, to the alarm of the congregation.

“ Another occurrence has caused much comment. As *Governor*, the Right Hon. R. M. O’Ferrall was invited to the Carmelitan Church, to

take part in the ritual there performed—where, too, the foreign Consuls were invited to *meet him*. The notes of invitation gave the first place to the Right Rev. the Bishop of Malta, and the second to the Governor—and the programme was carried out to the letter. All respect to the Governor, as Her Majesty's *locum tenens*, was lost, by the Right Rev. Prelate having *first* left the Church, with his followers, leaving the Governor to follow, as he thought fit."

The following is a copy of the address as translated by the *Malta Mail*:—

"MALTESE!—The Common Father of the believers, the Supreme Hierarch of the Church, the Grand Pio IX., has returned to his Throne at the Vatican, amidst the exultations of the whole Catholic world.

"His ingress into the capital of the Christian world is a new triumph for our most holy religion, for that faith of which the Apostolic chair holds the keys, and the power which St. Peter received from Jesus Christ, and transmits to all his successors.

"The tempest has now passed: the heads of the Satanic family have fled from the city of the Cæsars; the predictions of the pseudo-prophets have failed; and the republicans of disorder and of battle are no more.

"The miserable and disgraceful unions of shouting insects tremble, horrified on reading the inscription, in large letters, sculptured on the portals of the Eternal City—THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL AGAINST THEE.

"We also, sons of so tender a Father, *subjects of so kind a Sovereign*, let us also celebrate a day of such fortunate advent, for which our most beloved Bishop, in his pastoral letter, has destined the evening of Saturday next, for the illumination, and the following Sunday, the 5th, for a solemn mass and thanksgiving, with a solemn *Te Deum*, in all the churches of this our island.

"May you, oh Maltese, eminently Catholic, who ever give indubitable proofs of your attachment to the Holy Chair, co-operate in giving, in the face of the whole world, demonstrations of joy, by making a spontaneous illumination, not on Saturday only, but also on the morrow, which will be the Sunday following, so that impiety and irreligion, in the presence of your joy, may remain humbled, confused, annihilated. This day on which the four Catholic powers have replaced on his throne the immortal Pio IX., the great High Priest, has already been written, in letters of gold, in the annals of the world.

"Let us then rejoice, with songs and with hymns, giving an echo of the joy of the people of the Eternal City, and of the whole Catholic world."

NEWFOUNDLAND.—*Education*.—A public meeting of members of the Church has been held at St. John's, in January last, to consider the state of Church education in Newfoundland. It appears that the Legislative Council grants from the colonial chest an annual allowance of about 5000*l.* for education; but this sum is divided among Roman Catholics and dissenters of all denominations according to their

numbers, and the very small proportion which falls to the lot of the Church, has hitherto been administered either by the *Newfoundland School Society*, or by a mixed board of commissioners, in which clergymen, dissenting teachers, and laymen of all denominations are united. Under these circumstances, aggravated by the opposition offered to the Bishop by the *Newfoundland School Society*, it is cheering to find that a move is being made for a better state of things. The principal resolution passed at the meeting was to the following effect:—"That it is consistent with the principle already recognised by the legislature, and essential to the due promotion of Education in this Colony, that a proportionate part of any grant for the support of education, according to population, be awarded for the maintenance of schools, to be placed under the direction of the Bishop, Clergy, and other members of the Church of England only." Petitions in accordance with this resolution are to be presented to the legislature.

UNITED STATES.—*Diocese of Mississippi.*—*Pastoral Letter.*—Dr. Greene, who was consecrated Bishop of Mississippi on the second Sunday in Lent, at Jackson, the capital of the State, has issued the following Pastoral Letter to the members and friends of the Protestant Episcopal Church scattered abroad throughout the remoter parts of the Diocese of Mississippi.

"Dear Brethren,—It having pleased the great Head of the Church to put me in trust with the pastoral care of this Diocese, it becomes me, without delay, to set about the work which He has given me to do. Among the many duties pertaining to my office, there is none which demands more immediate attention than that of looking after the dispersed members of Christ's flock who have come to us from other dioceses, and are widely scattered throughout the several parts of this State, at a distance from the teachings and ministrations of the Church. It is in performance of this duty that I now address you, sending to each one of you my cordial greeting, and begging to be informed how I may best promote your spiritual good.

"Most of you, I fear, have suffered much from the want of those ministrations to which you were accustomed in the homes from which you came. Knowing this, therefore, and trusting that many of you are sincerely desirous of coming again under the instruction of the Church, and of worshipping at her altar, I now beg to be made acquainted with your wants, in order that, as God shall enable me, I may supply them.

"The labourers in this portion of the Lord's vineyard, though true to their trust, are as yet few in number. But, however faithful and diligent they may have been, they have been prevented, by the necessities of their position, from extending their labours beyond the immediate bounds in which they were employed. The same may be said of the labours of your late Provisional Bishop, and of the Bishops of Louisiana and Texas and Alabama, to whose nursing care this Diocese is so much indebted. Though desirous of imparting the full benefit of

their ministrations to each and all of you, the pressing demands of their own respective charges have rendered it impossible for them to visit the remoter parts of the State. Through the want, therefore, of more missionary help, and of a full and permanent organization of the Diocese, many portions of the interior have been unavoidably neglected. And it is feared, therefore, that a number of the sons and daughters of the Church have either been led by the spirit of the world to forget her teachings, or been driven by a sense of spiritual destitution into strange pastures. To search out those who remain, to gather them and their little ones into the fold of Christ, and to lead them to the waters of salvation, will ever be one of the most grateful, as it is assuredly one of the bounden duties of my charge.

“With a view, then, to the accomplishment of this object, I now write to you, requesting that each member and friend of the Church to whom this may come will, without delay, furnish me with the information which I ask for.

“The points on which I particularly desire to be informed are these:

“In what county do you reside? How far from the county-town? and in what direction?

“Are any of your neighbours acquainted with the Church, or desirous of knowing her?

“Is there any house or public room in your neighbourhood, in which our services could be occasionally held?

“Do you need any Bibles, Prayer Books, or Tracts? If so, inform me how many, and by what conveyance I may send them to you.

“An answer to these inquiries, and any other information calculated to promote the object of this communication, I will be thankful to receive, at an early date. You may address me directly at Natchez, or else make known your wishes to any Clergyman of the Church who may be most convenient to you.

“Commending you, dear Brethren, to the good Providence and Grace of our Heavenly Father, and praying that his best blessing may descend upon you, I subscribe myself your loving brother and servant in the Lord,

“WM. M. GREENE,

“Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church,
in the Diocese of Mississippi.

“*Jackson, Feb. 28, 1850.*”

Canon for the Excommunication of immoral and unsound Members.—The Convention of Pennsylvania has been engaged in the consideration of the following Canon which was laid over from the last Convention:—“*Offenders to be admonished or repelled from the Lord’s Table.*—“Any member of the Church, being a communicant thereof, conducting himself or herself in a manner unworthy of a Christian, ought to be admonished or repelled from the Lord’s Table, by the minister of the Parish or Church, according to the Rubric; and gaming, attendance on horse-racing, and theatrical amusements, witnessing immodest and licentious exhibitions or shows, attending public balls, the habitual neglect of public worship, or denial of the doctrines of the Gospel, as

generally set forth in the authorized Standards of the Church, are offences for which discipline should be exercised. This enumeration, however, shall not be construed to include all the subjects of discipline in the Church; and in cases where it may be deemed expedient by the minister, or may be requested by the accused, the Churchwardens, or either of them, if communicants, shall be summoned to assist the minister in ascertaining the facts of the case: provided, that, if such warden or wardens shall fail to refuse to act within ten days, the minister shall proceed to act under the rubrics of this Church." The discussion occupied the morning and afternoon sessions of an entire day, and ultimately the Canon was passed by the following vote of the Clergy and Laity; voting by orders:—Clergy: Ayes, 50; noes, 14.—Laity: Ayes, 44; noes 14.

Proposed new Bishopric of Florida.—At the Twelfth Annual Convention of the Diocese of Florida, held in January last, at Tallahassee, the report of the Committee, appointed at the last Convention, to devise ways and means for the support of a Bishop, was brought under consideration. The report recommended that an assessment should be laid on each parish in proportion to its ability, to commence from the election of a Bishop; and a Committee be appointed to solicit contributions in different portions of the Diocese; also that the Bishop should hold the Rectorship of one of the principal churches in the Diocese. In accordance with these recommendations, a resolution was unanimously adopted, urging the full attendance of the Clergy at the next Convention, with a view to proceed to the election of a Bishop. In the mean time the Standing Committee were directed to invite the Right Rev. Bishop Southgate to perform Episcopal functions in the Diocese, and to request the Board of Missions to extend him a support while so acting.

Dr. Jarvis.—The following resolution has been adopted by the Convention of Pennsylvania:—"That as the House of Bishops, and that of the Clerical and Lay Deputies, in the Convention of the year 1847, passed a resolution to this effect, 'that it be, and hereby is earnestly recommended to the members of the Church in the several dioceses to aid in carrying on the important work in which the rev. historiographer has been long engaged (while serving the Church without any stipend whatever, at a great expense of time and money on his part, to its great credit and advantage,) by giving to him or his agents their subscriptions, as well for the introductory volume, which has already appeared, as for the forthcoming volume or volumes of his history'—this Convention entreats the members of the Church in this diocese to comply with this earnest recommendation of our highest ecclesiastical council, and that the more especially as Dr. Jarvis has recently made an appeal to the Church for aid to publish the first volume of his history, which is now ready for the press."

Wisconsin Diocese.—*Appeal of the Bishop for support.*—The following passage from the address of Bishop Kemper to the late Convention of the Diocese of Wisconsin, throws a painful light upon the crippled

state of the Church in that part of the world :—“ The future prospects and present position of the Church in this diocese, are subjects to my mind of the deepest interest and anxiety. A people comparatively poor, and necessarily occupied with the various duties of new settlers, are anxious for the ministrations of the Gospel. Congregation after congregation can be organized and built up. But whom shall we send to proclaim to them the riches of the grace that is in Christ Jesus; and how shall they be supported? The experience of the few past years must satisfy us that our reliance upon the Board of Missions should be as slight as possible. Two clergymen have left us because they could not be sustained, and others feel as if they ought to follow their example for the same cause. And others, I know, are struggling with poverty, and almost with want. Under these circumstances, I must appeal to the laity, and I trust I can appeal to them in confidence. Cannot, dear brethren, cannot efforts, cannot even sacrifices be made for the glorious cause, in which the present peace and everlasting consolation of yourselves and children are deeply and permanently interested? I beseech you make it a subject of serious deliberation with your Christian friends, and of earnest private prayer. *Let each parish try if it cannot at once support its minister.* Who gives the tenth of his income to the cause of God and of his Church? And is it not a duty so to do? Are we not expected to give as freely as we have received? And will not even a cup of cold water, given from holy motives, be remembered and rewarded? ‘The earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof.’ Let us return to Him, for his worship and service, a portion of his gifts. There is that scattereth and yet increaseth. Many a parish can afford as much again as it now pours into the treasury of the Lord. But not only is the worship of your own sanctuary to be sustained; you should delight in the privilege of sending heralds of the cross to our distant and waste places.

“ Now is the time, brethren, for strenuous and successful exertions. We learn, from the daily papers, that two hundred and two congregations have been organized in this State by a highly respectable association of professing Christians. At the present moment we want eighteen clergymen or missionaries, besides one or two itinerants. I would that all the members of the Church now in the Diocese, be ascertained and found out, and the Gospel be brought to their doors, with all its vivifying truths and sanctifying tendencies, at least four times a year.

“ May then every parish that is organized, endeavour to become self-supporting. May all the missionary collections required by our canons, be punctually, faithfully, and generously made. And let us often ask ourselves: what do we with all our high privileges, and, I fear, frequent boasting,—what do we more than others? There is much land to be possessed; it is fertile and full of promise. And brethren, it is in fact our duty, a duty of the most imperative nature, for which we must at a future day account,—it is our duty to ‘do good, especially unto those who are of the household of faith.’ ”

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

Bell, Professor, his method of pronunciation, 454, 455; on good reading, 456; on emphasis, 457.

Bishop of London's Bill, debate on the, 361; import of the bill, 362; few speakers, 363; the State with respect to the Church and sects, 364; the Judicial Committee an unfit tribunal, 365; reply of Lord Lansdowne, and others, 366—369; Lord Redesdale's speech, 370—372; an adaptation of the law needed to the altered relations of the State and the Church, 373.

Bishoprics, Right of Appointment to, 279; not rightly vested in a State which has no positive religion, 280; but may lawfully be in the hands of temporal rulers, 281; this right defended by the assumed *foundation* of all the sees of England by sovereigns, 282; Emperors first appoint bishops to save disorders at elections, 283; progressive interference, 284—286; the claim of foundation, 287; of the see of Canterbury and others, 288—291; whether patronage a *right* of founders, 292, 293; mode of appointment of early English bishops, 294—299; the royal prerogative frequently restricted in times past, 300, 301; freedom of elections confirmed by Magna Charta, 302; and afterwards by various sovereigns, 303; the Statute of Provisors, 304; repeatedly confirmed till the reign of Henry VIII., 305; review of these facts, 306; the penalty of premunire, 307, 308; the prerogative of the Crown in appointing to deaneries, 309; appointments under William III., 310; the State no longer of the Church of England, 311, 312; duties of Churchmen, 313; to claim a restoration of the freedom of elections, 314; the endeavour to obtain an alteration in these laws not forbidden by the canons of 1603, 315.

Cathedral Music, remarks on the reformation of, 221; on the silence of congregations, 223; on the attention to pauses in chanting, 224.

Church, Position and Policy of the, 330; joined now to a creedless State, 331, 332; alliance but not union with such allowable, 333, 334; she recognizes the supremacy of a *Christian* sovereign, 335—337; rejects that now claimed by the State, 338; Dr. Pusey's volume on this subject, 339; Emperors in early times claimed no authority in controversies of faith, 340, 341; infidelity the danger of the present time, 342—344; firm hereditary faith to be maintained, 345; power of the State in its patronage, 346; grounds for hope, 347—350; the possible loss of temporalities, 351; the revival of Convocation, 352, 353; to be sought first from the Crown, 354; a voluntary convention might be assembled, 355; of whom composed, 356; by whom summoned, 357; when to commence, 358; the course it should pursue, 358—360.

Clough, Mr. Arthur, his poems, 207; clever, but atheistical, 209—211.

Cook, Rev. F. C., extract from his Commentary on Acts ii. l. 444, 445.

Constancy and Consistency in Christian Doctrine, extract from Mr. Sortain on, 448.

Deacons, practical disuse of the office of, 464, 465.

Denison, Rev. G., his protests against the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, 120.

Education Law of the French Republic, 237—241.

Education Question, the, 10; correspondence of the National Society, 11; the two committees, 12, 13; Kneller Hall, 14; the Parliamentary settlement of the

question, 15, 16; the meeting at Willis's Rooms, 17, 18; Mr. H. P. Hamilton's defence of the Privy Council, 19, 20; inspection of schools, 21; management clauses, 21—24; opposed to the principles of the National Society, 25, 26; exclude all Church schools, 27, 28; Mr. Kay's pamphlet, 29; compares education abroad and in England, 30, 31; his testimony to the zeal of the Clergy, 32, 33; upholds Romanism, 34, 35; his scheme, 36—38; the warning of Heidelberg, 39; Mr. W. J. Fox's bill, 40, 41; the Church will not sacrifice her principles, 42, 43.

Fasting, remarks by Rev. T. Dowell on, 458.

Gorham Case, the, 66; position of the Church not altered by this, 67—69; his doctrine, 70; Mr. Goode asserts the Calvinism of the Reformers, 71; though agreeing with Lutherans, 72; with the XVIIth Article, 73; and with Romanists, 74, 75; he admits defectibility of some grace, 76, 77; Elizabethan divines not Calvinistic, 78, 79; baptismal regeneration asserted in the Helvetic Confession, 80, 81; and by the Lambeth Articles, 82, 83; in accordance with St. Augustine's teaching, 84, 85; repentance and faith its conditions, 86, 87; except in infants, 88, 89; testimony of Luther and Bucer, 90—92; of Peter Martyr, 93; of the formularies of Henry VIII., 94, 95; doctrine held by our Church, 96—100; Archdeacon Wilberforce on baptismal regeneration, 101, 102; combined with predestination, 103, 104; the decision of the Privy Council, 105, 106; Mr. Keble's view of it, 107—109; historical examples for our conduct, 110—112; Convocation must end such controversies, 113—115; mode of conducting it, 116—118; present remedies, 119; protests of Mr. Denison, 120—122; of various Churchmen, 123, 124.

Gorham Case, the law of the, 374, 375; the limits of the question, 376; the Baptismal Services the only rule, 377; not the Articles, 378, 379; the word "regeneration," 380; as used in the Catechism and the Baptismal Services, 381—384; injustice of interpreting existing, by obsolete rubrics, 385, 386; or by private opinions of divines, 387, 388; Mr. Goode's vituperation of the bishop, 389, 390; the African code, 391; misrepresentation of Bishop Tay-

lor, 393; the Decades of Bullinger, 394; God's grace necessary for the healthful administration of the sacrament, 395; waverers implored to stand firm to the Church, 396; recapitulation of the arguments, 397, 398.

Guizot on Democracy, 316; radical ideas of "progress," 317; Rousseau objects to representative government as opposed to the supremacy of the will of man, 318; but would have small independent states, 319; radicals would assert the right of numbers to rule, 320; their theories of the equality and perfectibility of man against Scripture and nature, 321—323; the English Revolution guided by religious views, 324; the usurper unsupported, 325, 326; a Parisian election in 1850, 327; cruelty in rulers the consequence of insecurity, 328, 329.

Heiress in her Minority, the, 214; extract on the encouragement of industry, 216; on the rebellion of 1798, 217; on the formation of bogs, 218—221.

Irons, Rev. W. J., his "Present Crisis of the Church of England," 107.

Marriage Bill, Mr. Wortley's, 197; contrary to Scripture and the Church, 198; demonstrated by Mr. Roundell Palmer, 199—201; effects of any alteration in the law, 202, 203; why sought for, 204, 205; protests against it, 206.

Martineau, Miss, her *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, 44; the British Constitution, 45, 46; the Church despoiled by abolition of Corn-laws, 47; Mr. Willich, and Mr. Francklin's statements, 48—50; Parliamentary debates, 51; democratic change in our Constitution, 52, 53; by the Reform Bill, 54; a failure, 55; extension of franchise, 55—57; representation of corporations, 58, 59; liberty defined, 60, 61; funeral of Duke of York described by Miss Martineau, 62—64; comments on it, 65.

Maskell, Mr., his "Present Position of the High Church Party," 107.

Middling Classes, the, 1; isolated, 2, 3; uninfluenced by the Church, 4, 5; lack of books suited to them, 6; to farmers, 7; and emigrants, 8.

Mormonites, the, 399; increasing in England, 400; Joseph Smith's account of his call, 401, 402; the settlements of Mormonites, 403, 404; alleged revela-

tions to Joseph Smith, 405—412; to David Whitmer, 413, 414; the testimony of the three witnesses, 415; revelation to Martin Harris, 416; contents of the Book of Mormon, 417; its origin related by Mrs. Davison, 418—420; revelation about Joseph Smith, jun., 421, 422; the "Nephites," 423, 424; and the Jews, 425; the organization of their "Church," 426, 427; Smith appointed to the prophetic office, 428, 429; Sidney Rigdon joined with Smith, 430; the Safety Society Bank established and fails, 431; the "saints" removed to Missouri, 432; private property to be surrendered, 433, 434; foundation of Nauvoo, 435; Bennett's *exposé* of Mormonism, 436; their dreadful immorality and profanity, 437—439; death of Joseph Smith, 440.

Œdipus, translated by Sir F. H. Doyle, 151; strictures on translators, 152; the Greek drama part of their worship, 153—155; Greek and English tragedy contrasted, 156, 157; Greek tragedy fell with their religion, 158, 159; the story of the Œdipus, 160—163; often translated, 164, 165; examples of Sir F. Doyle's translation, 166—169; the advantages of classical literature, 170; and of such translations, 171, 172.

Offertory, Weekly, in the Isle of Man, 465.
Oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes, discovery of the MS. of, 227.

Petition to the Queen that doctrinal questions be referred to a Synod, 451.

Poor, the Maintenance of the, during the 16th century, 463.

Sanctification, remarks on the necessity of, by Mr. Woodward, 226.

Smith, Mr., his Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 257; Malta the Melita of St. Paul, 258, 259; St. Paul leaves Cæsarea, 260; the adverse wind, 261, 262; the "Fair Havens," 263, 264; the Euroclydon, 265; undergirding the vessel, 266, 267; "strake sail," 268, 269; the lack of food, 270; drawing near to land, 271; this St. Paul's Bay, Malta, 272; casting anchors out of the stern,

273; they "wished for the day," 274; the arrangement of rowers in a trireme, 275; St. Mark's Gospel a translation from St. Peter, 276; the construction of Eastern roofs in reference to the healing of "the sick of the palsy," 277, 278.

Stephens, Mr., his statutes relating to the Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institution, 303.

Supremacy Question, the, 173, the union of Church and State, 174; the position of the State in regard to the Church altered, 175, 176; the sovereign power no longer necessarily Christian, 177—180; we must *persevere* in demanding a reform, 181; Church Unions, 182—184; must demand Convocation, 185; Mr. Dodsworth's remarks on the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, 186—188; an appeal to temporal courts admissible and general, 189; except in matters of doctrine, 190; Church Union resolutions on the Gormham case, 191; remarks on the authority of the Committee of Council, by Mr. Allies, 192; by Mr. H. Wilberforce, 193, 194; by Mr. Irons, 195, 196.

Sweet, Rev. J. B., his defence of a refusal to profane the "Order for the Burial of the Dead," by using it over a Mormonite, 400.

Tasso, the life of, by Rev. R. Milman, 125; some errors pointed out, 128, 129; Tasso's origin and early life, 130—132; educated by the Jesuits, 133, 134; college life at Padua, 135; attaches himself to the court of Ferrara, 136; is introduced to Leonora, 137, 138; is persecuted by the Duke, 139—141; he flies, but returns to the same ill-treatment, 142—144; makes a pilgrimage to Loretto, 145; well treated by the Pope, 146; his last illness, 147; and death, 149; funereal honours, 150.

Vanity of Life, the, A.'s poem on, 212.

Wedding of a Hindoo with a prince of the royal house of Delhi, 443.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

1872







